

# Strong Partition Realations Below the Power Set: Consistency Was Sierpinski Right? II.

S. SHELAH\*

We continue here [Sh276] (see the introduction there) but we do not relay on it. The motivation was a conjecture of Galvin stating that  $2^\omega \geq \omega_2 + \omega_2 \rightarrow [\omega_1]_{h(n)}^n$  is consistent for a suitable  $h : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ . In section 5 we disprove this and give similar negative results. In section 3 we prove the consistency of the conjecture replacing  $\omega_2$  by  $2^\omega$ , which is quite large, starting with an Erdős cardinal. In section 1 we present iteration lemmas which needs when we replace  $\omega$  by a larger  $\lambda$  and in section 4 we generalize a theorem of Halpern and Lauchli replacing  $\omega$  by a larger  $\lambda$ .

## 0. Preliminaries

Let  $<_\chi^*$  be a well ordering of  $H(\chi)$ , where  $H(\chi) = \{x : \text{the transitive closure of } x \text{ has cardinality } < \chi\}$ , agreeing with the usual well-ordering of the

---

\* Publication no 288, summer 86. The author would like to thank the United States – Israel Binational Science Foundation for partially supporting this research.

ordinals.  $P$  (and  $Q, R$ ) will denote forcing notions, i.e. partial orders with a minimal element  $\emptyset = \emptyset_P$ .

A forcing notion  $P$  is  $\lambda$ -closed if every increasing sequence of members of  $P$ , of length less than  $\lambda$ , has an upper bound.

If  $P \in \mathbf{H}(\chi)$ , then for a sequence  $\bar{p} = \langle p_i : i < \gamma \rangle$  of members of  $P$  let  $\alpha = \alpha_{\bar{p}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{j : \{\beta_j : j < j\} \text{ has an upper bound in } P\}$  and define the *canonical upper bound of  $\bar{p}$* , & $\bar{p}$  as follows:

- (a) the least upper bound of  $\{p_i : i < \alpha\}$  in  $P$  if there exists such an element,
- (b) the  $<^*_\chi$ -first upper bound of  $\bar{p}$  if (a) can't be applied but there is such,
- (c)  $p_0$  if (a) and (b) fail,  $\gamma > 0$ ,
- (d)  $\emptyset_P$  if  $\gamma = 0$ .

Let  $p_0 \& p_1$  be the canonical upper bound of  $\langle p_\ell : \ell < 2 \rangle$ .

Take  $[a]^\kappa = \{b \subseteq a : |b| = \kappa\}$  and  $[a]^{<\kappa} = \bigcup_{\theta < \kappa} [a]^\theta$ .

For sets of ordinals,  $A$  and  $B$ , define  $H_{A,B}^{OP}$  as the maximal order preserving bijection between initial segments of  $A$  and  $B$ , i.e, it is the function with domain  $\{\alpha \in A : \text{otp}(\alpha \cap A) < \text{otp}(B)\}$ , and  $H_{A,B}^{OP}(\alpha) = \beta$  if and only if  $\alpha \in A$ ,  $\beta \in B$  and  $\text{otp}(\alpha \cap A) = \text{otp}(\beta \cap B)$ .

**Definition 0.1**  $\lambda \rightarrow^+ (\alpha)_\mu^{<\omega}$  holds provided whenever  $F$  is a function from  $[\lambda]^{<\omega}$  to  $\mu$ ,  $C \subseteq \lambda$  is a club then there is  $A \subseteq C$  of order type  $\alpha$  such that  $[w_1, w_2 \in [A]^{<\omega}, |w_1| = |w_2| \Rightarrow F(w_1) = F(w_2)]$ .

**Definition 0.2**  $\lambda \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\kappa, \theta}^n$  if for every function  $F$  from  $[\lambda]^n$  to  $\kappa$  there is  $A \subseteq \lambda$  of order type  $\alpha$  such that  $\{F(w) : w \in [A]^n\}$  has power  $\leq \theta$ .

**Definition 0.3** A forcing notion  $P$  satisfies the Knaster condition (has property K) if for any  $\{p_i : i < \omega_1\} \subset P$  there is an uncountable  $A \subset \omega_1$  such that the conditions  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  are compatible whenever  $i, j \in A$ .

## 1. Introduction

Concerning 1.1–1.3 see Shelah [Sh80], Shelah and Stanley [ShSt154, 154a].

**Definition 1.1.** A forcing notion  $Q$  satisfies  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$  where  $\varepsilon$  is a limit ordinal  $< \mu$ , if player I has a winning strategy in the following game:

Playing: the play finishes after  $\varepsilon$  moves.  
in the  $\alpha^{\text{th}}$  the move:

Player I – if  $\alpha \neq 0$  he chooses  $\langle q_\zeta^\alpha : \zeta < \mu^+ \rangle$  such that  $q_\zeta^\alpha \in Q$  and  $(\forall \beta < \alpha)(\forall \zeta < \mu^+) p_\zeta^\beta \leq q_\zeta^\alpha$  and he chooses a regressive function  $f_\alpha : \mu^+ \rightarrow \mu^+$  (i.e.  $f_\alpha(i) < 1 + i$ ); if  $\alpha = 0$  let  $q_\zeta^\alpha = \emptyset_Q$ ,  $f_\alpha = \emptyset$ .

Player II – he chooses  $\langle p_\zeta^\alpha : \zeta < \mu^+ \rangle$  such that  $q_\zeta^\alpha \leq p_\zeta^\alpha \in Q$ .

The outcome: Player I wins provided whenever  $\mu < \zeta < \xi < \mu^+$ ,  $\text{cf}(\zeta) = \text{cf}(\xi) = \mu$  and  $\wedge_{\beta < \varepsilon} f_\beta(\zeta) = f_\beta(\xi)$  the set  $\{p_\zeta^\alpha : \alpha < \varepsilon\} \cup \{p_\xi^\alpha : \alpha < \varepsilon\}$  has an upper bound in  $Q$ .

**Definition 1.2.** We call  $\langle P_i, Q_j : i \leq i(*), j < i(*) \rangle$  a  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ -iteration provided that:

- (a) it is a  $(< \mu)$ -support iteration ( $\mu$  is a regular cardinal)
- (b) if  $i_1 < i_2 \leq i(*)$ ,  $\text{cf } i_1 \neq \mu$  then  $P_{i_2}/P_{i_1}$  satisfies  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ .

**The Iteration Lemma 1.3.** If  $\bar{Q} = \langle P_i, Q_j : i \leq i(*), j < i(*) \rangle$  is a  $(< \mu)$ -support iteration, (a) or (b) or (c) below hold, then it is a  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ -iteration.

- (a)  $i(*)$  is limit and  $\bar{Q} \restriction j(*)$  is a  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ -iteration for every  $j(*) < i(*)$ .
- (b)  $i(*) = j(*) + 1$ ,  $\bar{Q} \restriction j(*)$  is a  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ -iteration and  $Q_{j(*)}$  satisfies  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$  in  $V^{P_{j(*)}}$ .
- (c)  $i(*) = j(*) + 1$ ,  $\text{cf } j(*) = \mu^+$ ,  $\bar{Q} \restriction j(*)$  is a  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ -iteration and for every successor  $i < j(*)$ ,  $P_{i(*)}/P_i$  satisfies  $*_\mu^\varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** Left to the reader (after reading [Sh80] or [ShSt154a]).

**Theorem 1.4.** Suppose  $\mu = \mu^{<\mu} < \chi < \lambda$ , and  $\lambda$  is a strongly inaccessible  $k_2^2$ -Mahlo cardinal, where  $k_2^2$  is a suitable natural number (see 3.6(2) of [Sh289]), and assume  $V = L$  for the simplicity. Then for some forcing notion  $P$ :

- (a)  $P$  is  $\mu$ -complete, satisfies the  $\mu^+$ -c.c., has cardinality  $\lambda$ , and  $V^P \models "2^\mu = \lambda"$ .
- (b)  $\Vdash_P \lambda \rightarrow [\mu^+]_3^2$  and even  $\lambda \rightarrow [\mu^+]_{\kappa,2}^2$  for  $\kappa < \mu$ .
- (c) if  $\mu = \aleph_0$  then  $\Vdash "MA_\chi"$ .

(d) if  $\mu > \aleph_0$  then:  $\Vdash_P$  “for every forcing notion  $Q$  of cardinality  $\leq \chi$ ,  $\mu$ -complete satisfying  $*_{\mu}^{\varepsilon}$ , and for any dense sets  $D_i \subseteq Q$  for  $i < i_0 < \lambda$ , there is a directed  $G \subseteq Q$ ,  $\bigwedge_i G \cap D_i \neq \emptyset$ ”.

As the proof is very similar to [Sh276], (particularly after reading section 3) we do not give details. We shall define below just the systems needed to complete the proof. More general ones are implicit in [Sh289].

**Convention 1.5.** We fix a one to one function  $Cd = Cd_{\lambda, \mu}$  from  ${}^{\mu}>\lambda$  onto  $\lambda$ .

**Remark.** Below we could have  $\text{otp}(B_x) = \mu^+ + 1$  with little change.

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $\mu < \chi < \kappa \leq \lambda$ ,  $\lambda = \lambda^{<\mu}$ ,  $\chi = \chi^{<\mu}$ ,  $\mu = \mu^{<\mu}$ .

- 1) We call  $x$  a  $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi, \mu)$ -precandidate if  $x = \langle a_u^x : u \in I_x \rangle$  where for some set  $B_x$  (unique, in fact):
  - (i)  $I_x = \{s : s \subseteq B_x, |s| \leq 2\}$ ,
  - (ii)  $B_x$  is a subset of  $\kappa$  of order type  $\mu^+$ ,
  - (iii)  $a_u^x$  is a subset of  $\lambda$  of cardinality  $\leq \chi$  closed under  $Cd$ ,
  - (iv)  $a_u^x \cap B_x = u$ ,
  - (v)  $a_u^x \cap a_v^x \subseteq a_{u \cap v}^x$ ,
  - (vi) if  $u, v \in I_x$ ,  $|u| = |v|$  then  $a_u^x$  and  $a_v^x$  have the same order type (and so  $H_{a_u^x, a_v^x}^{OP}$  maps  $a_u^x$  onto  $a_v^x$ ),
  - (vii) if  $u_\ell, v_\ell \in I_x$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$ ,  $|u_1| = |v_1|$ ,  $|u_2| = |v_2|$ ,  $|u_1 \cup u_2| = |v_1 \cup v_2|$ ,  $H_{a_{u_1}^x \cup a_{u_2}^x, a_{v_1}^x \cup a_{v_2}^x}^{OP}$  maps  $u_\ell$  onto  $v_\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  then  $H_{a_{u_1}^x, a_{v_1}^x}^{OP}$  and  $H_{a_{u_2}^x, a_{v_2}^x}^{OP}$  are compatible.
- 2) We say  $x$  is a  $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi, \mu)$ -candidate if it has the form  $\langle M_u^x : u \in I_x \rangle$  where
  - (i)  $\langle |M_u^x| : u \in I_x \rangle$  is a  $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi, \mu)$ -precandidate (with  $B_x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \cup I_x$ )
  - (ii)  $L_x$  is a vocabulary with  $\leq \chi$ -many  $< \mu$ -ary placespredicates and function symbols,
  - (iii) each  $M_u^x$  is an  $L_x$ -model,
  - (iv) for  $u, v \in I_x$ ,  $|u| = |v|$ ,  $M_u^x \restriction (|M_u^x| \cap |M_v^x|)$  is a model, and in fact an elementary submodel of  $M_v^x$ ,  $M_u^x$  and  $M_{u \cap v}^x$ .
- ( $\beta$ ) (\*) for  $u, v \in I_x$ ,  $|u| = |v|$ , the function  $H_{|M_u^x|, |M_v^x|}^{OP}$  is an isomorphism from  $M_u^x$  onto  $M_v^x$ .
- 3) The set  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a  $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi, \mu)$ -system if

- (A) each  $x \in \mathfrak{A}$  is a  $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi, \mu)$ -candidate,
- (B) guessing: if  $L$  is as in (2)( $\alpha$ )(ii),  $M^*$  is an  $L$ -model with universe  $\lambda$  then for some  $x \in \mathfrak{A}$ ,  $s \in B_x \Rightarrow M_s^x \prec M^*$ .

**Definition 1.7.** 1) We call the system  $\mathfrak{A}$  disjoint when:

- (\*) if  $x \neq y$  are from  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\text{otp}(|M_\emptyset^x|) \leq \text{otp}(|M_\emptyset^y|)$  then for some  $B_1 \subseteq B_x$ ,  $B_2 \subseteq B_y$  we have
  - a)  $|B_1| + |B_2| < \mu^+$
  - b) the sets

$$\bigcup \{|M_s^x| : s \in [B_x \setminus B_1]^{\leq 2}\}$$

and

$$\bigcup \{|M_s^y| : s \in [B_y \setminus B_2]^{\leq 2}\}$$

have intersection  $\subseteq M_\emptyset^y$ .

2) We call the system  $\mathfrak{A}$  almost disjoint when:

- (\*\*) if  $x, y \in \mathfrak{A}$ ,  $\text{otp}(|M_\emptyset^x|) \leq \text{otp}(|M_\emptyset^y|)$  then for some  $B_1 \subseteq B_x$ ,  $B_2 \subseteq B_y$  we have:
  - (a)  $|B_1| + |B_2| < \mu^+$ ,
  - (b) if  $s \in [B_x \setminus B_1]^{\leq 2}$ ,  $t \in [B_y \setminus B_2]^{\leq 2}$  then  $|M_s^x| \cap |M_t^y| \subseteq |M_\emptyset^y|$ .

## 2. Introducing the partition on trees

**Definition 2.1.** Let

- 1)  $\text{Per}(\mu^{>2}) = \{T : \text{where}$ 
  - (a)  $T \subseteq \mu^{>2}$ ,  $\langle \rangle \in T$ ,
  - (b)  $(\forall \eta \in T) (\forall \alpha < \text{lg}(\eta)) \eta \restriction \alpha \in T$ ,
  - (c) if  $\eta \in T \cap {}^\alpha 2$ ,  $\alpha < \beta < \mu$  then for some  $\nu \in T \cap {}^\beta 2$ ,  $\eta \triangleleft \nu$ ,
  - (d) if  $\eta \in T$  then for some  $\nu$ ,  $\eta \triangleleft \nu$ ,  $\nu \restriction \langle 0 \rangle \in T$ ,  $\nu \restriction \langle 1 \rangle \in T$ ,
  - (e) if  $\eta \in {}^\delta 2$ ,  $\delta < \mu$  is a limit ordinal and  $\{\eta \restriction \alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \subseteq T$  then  $\eta \in T$ .

2)  $\text{Per}_f(\mu^{>2}) = \left\{ T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2}) : \text{if } \alpha < \mu \text{ and } \nu_1, \nu_2 \in {}^\alpha 2 \cap T, \text{ then} \right.$

$$\left. \left[ \bigwedge_{\ell=0}^1 \nu_1 \hat{\wedge} \langle \ell \rangle \in T \iff \bigwedge_{\ell=0}^1 \nu_2 \hat{\wedge} \langle \ell \rangle \in T \right] \right\}.$$

3)  $\text{Per}_u(\mu^{>2}) = \{ T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2}) : \text{if } \alpha < \mu, \nu_1 \neq \nu_2 \text{ from } {}^\alpha 2 \cap T,$

$$\text{then } \bigvee_{\ell=0}^1 \bigvee_{m=1}^2 \nu_m \hat{\wedge} \langle \ell \rangle \notin T \}.$$

4) For  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$  let  $\lim T = \{ \eta \in {}^\mu 2 : (\forall \alpha < \mu) \eta \upharpoonright \alpha \in T \}$ .

5) For  $T \in \text{Per}_f(\mu^{>2})$  let  $\text{clp}_T : T \rightarrow {}^\mu 2$  be the unique one-to-one function from  $\text{sp}(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \eta \in T : \eta \hat{\wedge} \langle 0 \rangle \in T, \eta \hat{\wedge} \langle 1 \rangle \in T \}$  onto  $\mu^{>2}$ , which preserves  $\triangleleft$  and lexicographic order.

6) Let  $\text{SP}(T) = \{ \lg(\eta) : \eta \in \text{sp}(T) \}$ ,  $\text{sp}(\eta, \nu) = \min \{ i : \eta(i) \neq \nu(i) \text{ or } i = \lg(\eta) \text{ or } i = \lg(\nu) \}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** 1) For cardinals  $\mu, \sigma$  and  $n < \omega$  and  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$  let

$\text{Col}_\sigma^n(T) = \{ d : d \text{ is a function from } \cup_{\alpha < \mu} [{}^\alpha 2]^n \cap T \text{ to } \sigma \}$ . We will write  $d(\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1})$  for  $d(\langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle)$ .

2) Let  $<_\alpha^*$  denote a well ordering of  ${}^\alpha 2$  (in this section it is arbitrary). We call  $d \in \text{Col}_\sigma^n(T)$  end-homogeneous for  $\langle <_\alpha^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  provided that: if  $\alpha < \beta$  are from  $\text{SP}(T)$ ,  $\{ \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \} \subseteq {}^\beta 2 \cap T$ ,  $\langle \nu_\ell \upharpoonright \alpha : \ell < n \rangle$  are pairwise distinct and  $\bigwedge_{\ell, m} [\nu_\ell <_\beta^* \nu_m \iff \nu_\ell \upharpoonright \alpha <_\alpha^* \nu_m \upharpoonright \alpha]$  then

$$d(\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1}) = d(\nu_0 \upharpoonright \alpha, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \upharpoonright \alpha).$$

3) Let  $\text{Eh Col}_\sigma^n(T) = \{ d \in \text{Col}_\sigma^n(T) : d \text{ is end-homogeneous} \}$  (for some  $\langle <_\alpha^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ ).

4) For  $\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1}, \eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-1}$  from  $\mu^{>2}$ , we say  $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle$  and  $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-1} \rangle$  are strongly similar for  $\langle <_\alpha^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  if:

(i)  $\lg(\nu_\ell) = \lg(\eta_\ell)$

(ii)  $\text{sp}(\nu_\ell, \nu_m) = \text{sp}(\eta_\ell, \eta_m)$

(iii) if  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4 < n$  and  $\alpha = \text{sp}(\nu_{\ell_1}, \nu_{\ell_2})$  then

$$\nu_{\ell_3} \upharpoonright \alpha <_\alpha^* \nu_{\ell_4} \upharpoonright \alpha \iff \eta_{\ell_3} \upharpoonright \alpha <_\alpha^* \eta_{\ell_4} \upharpoonright \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{\ell_3}(\alpha) = \eta_{\ell_3}(\alpha)$$

5) For  $\nu_0^a, \dots, \nu_{n-1}^a, \nu_0^b, \dots, \nu_{n-1}^b$  from  $\mu^{>2}$  we say  $\bar{\nu}^a = \langle \nu_0^a, \dots, \nu_{n-1}^a \rangle$  and  $\bar{\nu}^b = \langle \nu_0^b, \dots, \nu_{n-1}^b \rangle$  are similar if the truth values of (i)–(iii) below do not depend on  $t \in \{a, b\}$  for any  $\ell(1), \ell(2), \ell(3), \ell(4) < n$ :

- (i)  $\lg(\nu_{\ell(1)}^t) < \lg(\nu_{\ell(2)}^t)$
- (ii)  $\text{sp}(\nu_{\ell(1)}^t, \nu_{\ell(2)}^t) < \text{sp}(\nu_{\ell(3)}^t, \nu_{\ell(4)}^t)$
- (iii) for  $\alpha = \text{sp}(\nu_{\ell(1)}^t, \nu_{\ell(2)}^t)$ ,

$$\nu_{\ell(3)}^t \upharpoonright \alpha <_{\alpha}^* \nu_{\ell(4)}^t \upharpoonright \alpha$$

and

$$\nu_{\ell(3)}^t(\alpha) = 0.$$

- 6) We say  $d \in \text{Col}_{\sigma}^n(T)$  is almost homogeneous [homogeneous] on  $T_1 \subseteq T$  (for  $\langle <_{\alpha}^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ ) if for every  $\alpha \in \text{SP}(T_1)$ ,  $\bar{\nu}, \bar{\eta} \in [{}^{\alpha}2]^n \cap T_1$  which are strongly similar [similar] we have  $d(\bar{\nu}) = d(\bar{\eta})$ .
- 7) We say  $\langle <_{\alpha}^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  is nice to  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$ , provided that: if  $\alpha < \beta$  are from  $\text{SP}(T)$ ,  $(\alpha, \beta) \cap \text{SP}(T) = \emptyset$ ,  $\eta_1 \neq \eta_2 \in {}^{\beta}2 \cap T$ ,  $[\eta_1 \upharpoonright \alpha <_{\alpha}^* \eta_2 \upharpoonright \alpha \text{ or } \eta_1 \upharpoonright \alpha = \eta_2 \upharpoonright \alpha, \eta_1(\alpha) < \eta_2(\alpha)]$  then  $\eta_1 <_{\beta}^* \eta_2$ .

**Definition 2.3.** 1)  $\text{Pr}_{eht}(\mu, n, \sigma)$  means: for every  $d \in \text{Col}_{\sigma}^n(\mu^{>2})$  for some  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$ ,  $d$  is end homogeneous on  $T$ .

- 2)  $\text{Pr}_{aht}(\mu, n, \sigma)$  means for every  $d \in \text{Col}_{\sigma}^n(\mu^{>2})$  for some  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$ ,  $d$  is almost homogeneous on  $T$ .
- 3)  $\text{Pr}_{ht}(\mu, n, \sigma)$  means for every  $d \in \text{Col}_{\sigma}^n(\mu^{>2})$  for some  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$ ,  $d$  is homogeneous on  $T$ .
- 4) For  $x \in \{eht, aht, ht\}$ ,  $\text{Pr}_x^f(\mu, n, \sigma)$  is defined like  $\text{Pr}_x(\mu, n, \sigma)$  but we demand  $T \in \text{Per}_f(\mu^{>2})$ .
- 5) If above we replace  $eht, aht, ht$  by  $ehnt, ahnt, hnt$ , respectively, this means  $\langle <_{\alpha}^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  is fixed apriori.
- 6) Replacing  $n$  by “ $< \kappa$ ”,  $\sigma$  by  $\bar{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_{\ell} : \ell < \kappa \rangle$  for  $\kappa \leq \aleph_0$ , means that  $\langle d_n : n < \kappa \rangle$  are given,  $d_n \in \text{Col}_{\sigma}^n(\mu^{>2})$  and the conclusion holds for all  $d_n$  ( $n < \kappa$ ) simultaneously. Replacing “ $\sigma$ ” by “ $< \sigma$ ” means that the assertion holds for every  $\sigma_1 < \sigma$ .

**Definition 2.4.** 1)  $\text{Pr}_{aht}(\mu, n, \sigma(1), \sigma(2))$  means: for every  $d \in \text{Col}_{\sigma(1)}^n(\mu^{>2})$  for some  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu^{>2})$  and  $\langle <_{\alpha}^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  for every  $\bar{\eta} \in \bigcup \{[{}^{\alpha}2]^n \cap T : \alpha \in \text{SP}(T)\}$ ,

$$\left\{ d(\bar{\nu}) : \bar{\nu} \in \bigcup \{[{}^{\alpha}2]^n \cap T_1 : \alpha \in \text{SP}(T_1)\}, \right. \\ \left. \bar{\eta} \text{ and } \bar{\nu} \text{ are strongly similar for } \langle <_{\alpha}^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle \right\}$$

has cardinality  $< \sigma(2)$ .

- 2)  $\text{Pr}_{ht}(\mu, n, \sigma(1), \sigma(2))$  is defined similarly with “similar” instead of “strongly similar”.
- 3)  $\text{Pr}_x(\mu, < \kappa, \langle \sigma_\ell^1 : \ell < \kappa \rangle \langle \sigma_\ell^2 : \ell < \kappa \rangle)$ ,  $\text{Pr}_x^f(\mu, n, \sigma(1), \sigma(2))$ ,  $\text{Pr}_x^f(\mu, < \aleph_0, \bar{\sigma}^1, \bar{\sigma}^2)$  are defined in the same way.

There are many obvious implications.

**Fact 2.5.** 1) For every  $T \in \text{Per}(\mu > 2)$  there is a  $T_1 \subseteq T$ ,  $T_1 \in \text{Per}_u(\mu > 2)$ .

- 2) In defining  $\text{Pr}_x^f(\mu, n, \sigma)$  we can demand  $T \subseteq T_0$  for any  $T_0 \in \text{Per}_f(\mu > 2)$ , similarly for  $\text{Pr}_x^f(\mu, < \kappa, \sigma)$ .
- 3) The obvious monotonicity holds.

**Claim 2.6.** 1) Suppose  $\mu$  is regular,  $\sigma \geq \aleph_0$  and  $\text{Pr}_{eht}^f(\mu, n, < \sigma)$ . Then  $\text{Pr}_{aht}^f(\mu, n, < \sigma)$  holds.

- 2) If  $\mu$  is weakly compact and  $\text{Pr}_{aht}^f(\mu, n, < \sigma)$ ,  $\sigma < \mu$ , then  $\text{Pr}_{ht}^f(\mu, n, < \sigma)$  holds.
- 3) If  $\mu$  is Ramsey and  $\text{Pr}_{aht}^f(\mu, < \aleph_0, < \sigma)$ ,  $\sigma < \mu$ , then  $\text{Pr}_{ht}^f(\mu, < \aleph_0, < \sigma)$ .
- 4) If  $\mu = \omega$ , in the “nice” version, the orders  $\langle <_\alpha^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  disappear.

**Proof.** : Check it.

The following theorem is a quite strong positive result for  $\mu = \omega$ . Halpern Lauchli proved 2.7(1), Laver proved 2.7(2) (and hence (3)), Pincus pointed out that Halpern Lauchli’s proof can be modified to get 2.7(2), and then  $\text{Pr}_{eht}^f(\omega, n, < \sigma)$  and (by it)  $\text{Pr}_{ht}^f(\omega, n, < \sigma)$  are easy.

**Theorem 2.7.** 1) If  $d \in \text{Col}_\sigma^n(\omega > 2)$ ,  $\sigma < \aleph_0$ , then there are  $T_0, \dots, T_{n-1} \in \text{Per}_f(\omega > 2)$  and  $k_0 < k_1 < \dots < k_\ell < \dots$  and  $s < \sigma$  such that for every  $\ell < \omega$  : if  $\mu_0 \in T_0, \mu_1 \in T_1, \dots, \mu_{n-1} \in T_{n-1}$ ,  $\bigwedge_{m < n} \text{lg}(\nu_m) = k_\ell$ , then  $d(\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1}) = s$ .

- 2) We can demand in (1) that

$$\text{SP}(T_\ell) = \{k_0, k_1, \dots\}$$

- 3)  $\text{Pr}_{htn}^f(\omega, n, \sigma)$  for  $\sigma < \aleph_0$ .
- 4)  $\text{Pr}_{htn}^f(\omega, < \aleph_0, \langle \sigma_n^1 : n < \omega \rangle, \langle \sigma_n^2 : n < \omega \rangle)$  if  $\sigma_n^1 < \aleph_0$  and  $\langle \sigma_n^2 : n < \omega \rangle$  diverge to infinity.



**Definition 2.8.** Let  $d$  be a function with domain  $\supseteq [A]^n$ ,  $A$  be a set of ordinals,  $F$  be a one-to-one function from  $A$  to  ${}^{\alpha(*)}2$ ,  $<^*_\alpha$  be a well ordering of  ${}^\alpha 2$  for  $\alpha \leq \alpha(*)$  such that  $F(\alpha) <^*_\alpha F(\beta) \iff \alpha < \beta$ , and  $\sigma$  be a cardinal.

1) We say  $d$  is  $(F, \sigma)$ -canonical on  $A$  if for any  $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n \in A$ ,

$$\left| \left\{ d(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) : \langle F(\beta_1), \dots, F(\beta_n) \rangle \text{ similar to } \langle F(\alpha_1), \dots, F(\alpha_n) \rangle \right\} \right| \leq \sigma.$$

2) We define “almost  $(F, \sigma)$ -canonical” similarly using strongly similar instead of “similar”.

### 3. Consistency of a strong partition below the continuum

This section is dedicated to the proof of

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose  $\lambda$  is the first Erdős cardinal, i.e. the first such that  $\lambda \rightarrow (\omega_1)_2^{<\omega}$ . Then, if  $A$  is a Cohen subset of  $\lambda$ , in  $V[A]$  for some  $\aleph_1$ -c.c. forcing notion  $P$  of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,  $\Vdash_P$  “ $\text{MA}_{\aleph_1}(\text{Knaster}) + 2^{\aleph_0} = \lambda$ ” and:

- 1.)  $\Vdash_P$  “ $\lambda \rightarrow [\aleph_1]_{h(n)}^n$ ” for suitable  $h : \omega \mapsto \omega$  (explicitly defined below).
- 2.) In  $V^P$  for any colorings  $d_n$  of  $\lambda$ , where  $d_n$  is  $n$ -place, and for any divergent  $\langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$  (see below), there is a  $W \subseteq \lambda$ ,  $|W| = \aleph_1$  and a function  $F : W \mapsto {}^\omega 2$  such that:  $d_n$  is  $(F, \sigma_n)$ -canonical on  $W$  for each  $n$ . (See definition 2.8 above.)

**Remark 3.2.**  $h(n)$  is  $n!$  times the number of  $u \in [{}^\omega 2]^n$  satisfying (if  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_4 \in u$  are distinct then  $\text{sp}(\eta_1, \eta_2)$ ,  $\text{sp}(\eta_3, \eta_4)$  are distinct) up to strong similarity for any nice  $\langle <^*_\alpha : \alpha < \omega \rangle$ .

2) A sequence  $\langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$  is divergent if  $\forall m \exists k \forall n \geq k \sigma_n \geq m$ .

**Notation 3.3.** For a sequence  $a = \langle \alpha_i, e_i^* : i < \alpha \rangle$ , we call  $b \subseteq \alpha$  closed if

- (i)  $i \in b \Rightarrow a_i \subseteq b$
- (ii) if  $i < \alpha$ ,  $e_i^* = 1$  and  $\sup(b \cap i) = i$  then  $i \in b$ .

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $\mathfrak{K}$  be the family of  $\bar{Q} = \langle P_i, Q_j, a_j, e_j^* : j < \alpha, i \leq \alpha \rangle$  such that

- (a)  $a_i \subseteq i$ ,  $|a_i| \leq \aleph_1$ ,
- (b)  $a_i$  is closed for  $\langle a_j, e_j^* : j < i \rangle$ ,  $e_i^* \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $[e_i^* = 1 \Rightarrow \text{cf } i = \aleph_1]$
- (c)  $P_i$  is a forcing notion,  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  is a  $P_j$ -name of a forcing notion of power  $\aleph_1$  with minimal element  $\emptyset$  or  $\emptyset_j$  and for simplicity the underlying set of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  is  $\subseteq [\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0}$  (we do not lose by this).
- (d)  $P_\beta = \{p : p \text{ is a function whose domain is a finite subset of } \beta \text{ and for } i \in \text{dom}(p), \Vdash_{P_i} "f(i) \in \mathcal{Q}_i"\}$  with the order  $p \leq q$  if and only if for  $i \in \text{dom}(p)$ ,  $q \restriction i \Vdash_{P_i} "p(i) \leq q(i)"$ .
- (e) for  $j < i$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  is a  $P_j$ -name involving only antichains contained in  $\{p \in P_j : \text{dom}(p) \subseteq a_j\}$ .

For  $p \in P_i$ ,  $j < i$ ,  $j \notin \text{dom } p$  we let  $p(j) = \emptyset$ . Note for  $p \in P_i$ ,  $j \leq i$ ,  $p \restriction j \in P_j$

**Definition 3.5.** For  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}$  as above (so  $\alpha = \text{lg}(\bar{Q})$ ):

1) for any  $b \subseteq \beta \leq \alpha$  closed for  $\langle a_i, e_i^* : i < \beta \rangle$  we define  $P_b^{\text{cn}}$  [by simultaneous induction on  $\beta$ ]:

$$P_b^{\text{cn}} = \{p \in P_\beta : \text{dom } p \subseteq b, \text{ and for } i \in \text{dom } p, p(i) \text{ is a canonical name}\}$$

i.e., for any  $x$ ,  $\{p \in P_{a_i}^{\text{cn}} : p \Vdash_{P_i} "p(i) = x" \text{ or } p \Vdash_{P_i} "p(i) \neq x" \}$  is a predense subset of  $P_i$ .

2) For  $\bar{Q}$  as above,  $\alpha = \text{lg}(\bar{Q})$ , take  $\bar{Q} \restriction \beta = \langle P_i, \mathcal{Q}_j, a_j : i \leq \beta, j < \beta \rangle$  for  $\beta \leq \alpha$  and the order is the order in  $P_\alpha$  (if  $\beta \geq \alpha$ ,  $\bar{Q} \restriction \beta = \bar{Q}$ ).

3) " $b$  closed for  $\bar{Q}$  means " $b$  closed for  $\langle a_i, e_i^* : i < \text{lg } \bar{Q} \rangle$ ".

**Fact 3.6.** 1) if  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}$  then  $\bar{Q} \restriction \beta \in \mathfrak{K}$ .

2) Suppose  $b \subseteq c \subseteq \beta \leq \text{lg}(\bar{Q})$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are closed for  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}$ .

- (i) If  $p \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$  then  $p \restriction b \in P_b^{\text{cn}}$ .
- (ii) If  $p, q \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$  and  $p \leq q$  then  $p \restriction b \leq q \restriction b$ .
- (iii)  $P_c^{\text{cn}} \restriction P_\beta$ . 3)  $\text{lg } \bar{Q}$  is closed for  $\bar{Q}$ .
- 4) if  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}$ ,  $\alpha = \text{lg } \bar{Q}$  then  $P_\alpha^{\text{cn}}$  is a dense subset of  $P_\alpha$ .
- 5) If  $b$  is closed for  $\bar{Q}$ ,  $p, q \in P_{\text{lg } \bar{Q}}^{\text{cn}}$ ,  $p \leq q$  in  $P_{\text{lg } \bar{Q}}$  and  $i \in \text{dom } p$  then  $q \restriction a_i \Vdash_{P_i} "p(i) \leq q(i)"$  hence  $\Vdash_{P_{a_i}^{\text{cn}}} "p(i) \leq_{Q_i} q(i)"$ .

**Definition 3.7.** Suppose  $W = (W, \leq)$  is a finite partial order and  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}$ .

1)  $IN_W(\bar{Q})$  is the set of  $\bar{b}$ -s satisfying  $(\alpha)$ – $(\gamma)$  below:

- ( $\alpha$ )  $\bar{b} = \langle b_w : w \in W \rangle$  is an indexed set of  $\bar{Q}$ -closed subsets of  $\text{lg}(\bar{Q})$ ,  
 ( $\beta$ )  $W \models "w_1 \leq w_2" \Rightarrow b_{w_1} \subseteq b_{w_2}$ ,  
 ( $\gamma$ )  $\zeta \in b_{w_1} \cap b_{w_2}$ ,  $w_1 \leq w$ ,  $w_2 \leq w$  then  $(\exists u \in W) \zeta \in b_u \wedge u \leq w_1 \wedge u \leq w_2$ .  
 We assume  $\bar{b}$  codes  $(W, \leq)$ .  
 2) For  $\bar{b} \in IN_W(\bar{Q})$ , let

$$\bar{Q}[\bar{b}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle p_w : w \in W \rangle : p_w \in P_{b_w}^{\text{cn}}, [W \models w_1 \leq w_2 \Rightarrow p_{w_2} \upharpoonright b_{w_1} = p_{w_1}] \}$$

with ordering  $\bar{Q}[\bar{b}] \models \bar{p}^1 \leq \bar{p}^2$  iff  $\bigwedge_{w \in W} p_w^1 \leq p_w^2$ .

3) Let  $\mathfrak{K}^1$  be the family of  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}$  such that for every  $\beta \leq \text{lg}(\bar{Q})$  and  $(\bar{Q} \upharpoonright \beta)$ -closed  $b$ ,  $P_\beta$  and  $P_\beta/P_b^{\text{cn}}$  satisfy the Knaster condition.

**Fact 3.8.** Suppose  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}^1$ ,  $(W, \leq)$  is a finite partial order,  $\bar{b} \in IN_W(\bar{Q})$  and  $\bar{p} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ .

1) If  $w \in W$ ,  $p_w \leq q \in P_{b_w}^{\text{cn}}$  then there is  $\bar{r} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ ,  $q \leq r_w$ ,  $\bar{p} \leq \bar{r}$ , in fact

$$r_u(\gamma) = \begin{cases} p_u(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in \text{Dom } p_u \setminus \text{Dom } q \\ p_u(\gamma) \ \& \ q(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in b_u \cap \text{Dom } q \text{ and for some } v \in W, \\ & v \leq u, v \leq w \text{ and } \gamma \in b_v \\ p_u(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in b_u \cap \text{dom } q \text{ but the previous case fails} \end{cases}$$

2) Suppose  $(W_1, \leq)$  is a submodel of  $(W_2, \leq)$ , both finite partial orders,  $\bar{b}^1 \in IN_{W_1}(\bar{Q})$ ,  $\bar{b}_w^1 = \bar{b}_w^2$  for  $w \in W_1$ .

( $\alpha$ ) If  $\bar{q} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}^2]$  then  $\langle q_w : w \in W_1 \rangle \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}^1]$ .

( $\beta$ ) If  $\bar{p} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}^1]$  then there is  $\bar{q} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}^2]$ ,  $\bar{q} \upharpoonright W_1 = \bar{p}$ , in fact  $q_w(\gamma)$  is  $p_u(\gamma)$  if  $u \in W_1$ ,  $\gamma \in b_u$ ,  $u \leq w$ , provided that

(\*\*) if  $w_1, w_2 \in W_1$ ,  $w \in W_2$ ,  $w_1 \leq w$ ,  $w_2 \leq w$  and  $\zeta \in b_{w_1} \cap b_{w_2}$  then for some  $v \in W_1$ ,  $\zeta \in b_v$ ,  $v \leq w_1$ ,  $v \leq w_2$ .

(this guarantees that if there are several  $u$ 's as above we shall get the same value).

3) If  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}^1$  then  $\bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$  satisfies the Knaster condition. If  $\emptyset$  is the minimal element of  $W$  (i.e.  $u \in W \Rightarrow W \models \emptyset \leq u$ ) then  $\bar{Q}[\bar{b}]/P_{b_\emptyset}^{\text{cn}}$  also satisfies the Knaster condition and so  $\langle \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ , when we identify  $p \in P_b^{\text{cn}}$  with  $\langle p : w \in W \rangle$ .

**Proof.** 1) It is easy to check that each  $r_u(\gamma)$  is in  $P_{b_u}^{\text{cn}}$ . So, in order to prove  $\bar{r} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ , we assume  $W \models u_1 \leq u_2$  and has to prove that  $r_{u_2} \upharpoonright b_{u_1} = r_{u_1}$ . Let  $\zeta \in b_{u_1}$ .

First case:  $\zeta \notin \text{Dom}(p_{u_1}) \cup \text{Dom } q$ .

So  $\zeta \notin \text{Dom}(r_{u_1})$  (by the definition of  $r_{u_1}$ ) and  $\zeta \notin \text{Dom } p_{u_2}$  (as  $\bar{p} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ ) hence  $\zeta \notin (\text{Dom } p_{u_2}) \cup (\text{Dom } q)$  hence  $\zeta \notin \text{Dom}(r_{u_2})$  by the choice of  $r_{u_2}$ , so we have finished.

Second case:  $\zeta \in \text{Dom } p_{u_1} \setminus \text{Dom } q$ .

As  $\bar{p} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$  we have  $p_{u_1}(\zeta) = p_{u_2}(\zeta)$ , and by their definition,  $r_{u_1}(\zeta) = p_{u_1}(\zeta)$ ,  $r_{u_2}(\zeta) = p_{u_2}(\zeta)$ .

Third case:  $\zeta \in \text{Dom } q$  and  $(\exists v \in W) (\zeta \in b_v \wedge v \leq u_1 \wedge v \leq w)$ . By the definition of  $r_{u_1}(\zeta)$ , we have  $r_{u_1}(\zeta) = p_{u_1}(\zeta) \& q(\zeta)$ , also the same  $v$  witnesses  $r_{u_2}(\zeta) = p_{u_2}(\zeta) \& q(\zeta)$ , (as  $\zeta \in b_v \wedge v \leq u_1 \wedge v \leq w \Rightarrow \zeta \in b_v \wedge v \leq u_2 \wedge v \leq w$ ) and of course  $p_{u_1}(\zeta) = p_{u_2}(\zeta)$  (as  $\bar{p} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ ).

Fourth case:  $\zeta \in \text{Dom } q$  and  $\neg(\exists v \in W) (\zeta \in b_v \wedge v \leq u_1 \wedge v \leq w)$ .

By the definition of  $r_{u_1}(\zeta)$  we have  $r_{u_1}(\zeta) = p_{u_1}(\zeta)$ . It is enough to prove that  $r_{u_2}(\zeta) = p_{u_2}(\zeta)$  as we know that  $p_{u_1}(\zeta) = p_{u_2}(\zeta)$  (because  $\bar{p} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ ,  $u_1 \leq u_2$ ). If not, then for some  $v_0 \in W$ ,  $\zeta \in b_{v_0} \wedge v_0 \leq u_2 \wedge v_0 \leq w$ . But  $\bar{b} \in \text{IN}_W(\bar{Q})$ , hence (see Def. 3.7(1) condition  $(\gamma)$  applied with  $\zeta$ ,  $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ ,  $w$  there standing for  $\zeta$ ,  $v_0$ ,  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$  here) we know that for some  $v \in W$ ,  $\zeta \in v \wedge v \leq v_0 \wedge v \leq u_1$ . As  $(W, \leq)$  is a partial order,  $v \leq v_0$  and  $v_0 \leq w$ , we can conclude  $v \leq w$ . So  $v$  contradicts our being in the fourth case. So we have finished the fourth case.

Hence we have finished proving  $\bar{r} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ . We also have to prove  $q \leq r_w$ , but for  $\zeta \in \text{Dom } q$  we have  $\zeta \in b_w$  (as  $q \in P_w^{\text{cn}}$  is on assumption) and  $r_w(\zeta) = q(\zeta)$  because  $r_w(\zeta)$  is defined by the second case of the definition as  $(\exists v \in W) (\zeta \in b_w \wedge v \leq w \wedge v \leq w)$ , i.e.  $v = w$ .

Lastly we have to prove that  $\bar{p} \leq \bar{r}$  (in  $\bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ ). So let  $u \in W$ ,  $\zeta \in \text{Dom } p_u$  and we have to prove  $r_u \upharpoonright \zeta \Vdash_{P_\zeta} "p_u(\zeta) \leq_{P_\zeta} r_u(\zeta)"$ . As  $r_u(\zeta)$  is  $p_u(\zeta)$  or  $p_u(\zeta) \& q(\zeta)$  this is obvious.

2) Immediate.

3) We prove this by induction on  $|W|$ .

For  $|W| = 0$  this is totally trivial.

For  $|W| = 1, 2$  this is assumed.

For  $|W| > 2$  fix  $\bar{p}^i \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$  for  $i < \omega_1$ . Choose a maximal element  $v \in W$  and let  $c = \bigcup \{b_w : W \models w < v\}$ . Clearly  $c$  is closed for  $\bar{Q}$ .

We know that  $P_c^{\text{cn}}$ ,  $P_{b_v}^{\text{cn}}/P_c^{\text{cn}}$  are Knaster by the induction hypothesis. We also know that  $p_v^i \upharpoonright c \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$  for  $i < \omega_1$ , hence for some  $r \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$ ,

$$r \Vdash " \bar{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ i < \omega_1 : p_v^i \upharpoonright c \in G_{P_c^{\text{cn}}} \right\} \text{ is uncountable} "$$

hence

$\Vdash$  "there is an uncountable  $A^1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that

$$[i, j \in A^1 \Rightarrow p_v^i, p_v^j \text{ are compatible in } P_{b_v}^{\text{cn}} / G_{P_c^{\text{cn}}}] .$$

Fix a  $P_c^{\text{cn}}$ -name  $\mathcal{A}^1$  for such an  $A^1$ .

Let  $A^2 = \{i < \omega_1 : \exists q \in P_c^{\text{cn}}, q \Vdash i \in \mathcal{A}^1\}$ . Necessarily  $|A_2| = \aleph_1$ , and for  $i \in A^2$  there is  $q^i \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$ ,  $q^i \Vdash i \in A^1$ , and w.l.o.g.  $p_v^i \restriction c \leq q^i$ . Note that  $p_v^i \& q^i \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$ .

For  $i \in A^2$  let,  $\bar{r}^i$  be defined using 3.8(1) (with  $\bar{p}^i, p_v^i \& q^i$ ). Let  $W_1 = W \setminus \{v\}$ ,  $\bar{b}' = \langle b_w : w \in W_1 \rangle$ .

By the induction hypothesis applied to  $W_1$ ,  $\bar{b}'$ ,  $\bar{r}^i \restriction W_1$ , for  $i \in A^2$  there is an uncountable  $A^3 \subseteq A^2$  and for  $i < j$  in  $A^3$ , there is  $\bar{r}^{i,j} \in \bar{Q}[\bar{b}']$ ,  $\bar{r}^i \restriction W_1 \leq \bar{r}^{i,j}$ , and  $\bar{r}^j \restriction W_1 \leq \bar{r}^{i,j}$ . Now define  $r_c^{i,j} \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$  as follows: its domain is  $\bigcup \{\text{dom } r_w^{i,j} : W \models w < v\}$ ,  $r_c^{i,j} \restriction (\text{dom } r_w^{i,j}) = r_w^{i,j}$  whenever  $W \models w < v$ . Why is this a definition? As if  $W \models w_1 \leq v \wedge w_2 \leq v$ ,  $\zeta \in b_{w_1} \wedge \zeta \in b_{w_2}$  then for some  $u \in W$ ,  $u \leq w_1 \wedge u \leq w_2$  and  $\zeta \in u$ . It is easy to check that  $r_c^{i,j} \in P_c^{\text{cn}}$ . Now  $r_c^{i,j} \Vdash_{P_c^{\text{cn}}} "p_{b_v}^i, p_{b_v}^j \text{ are compatible in } P_{b_v}^{\text{cn}} / P_c^{\text{cn}}"$ .

So there is  $r \in P_{b_v}^{\text{cn}}$  such that  $r_c^{i,j} \leq r$ ,  $p_{b_v}^i \leq r$ ,  $p_{b_v}^j \leq r$ . As in part (1) of 3.8 we can combine  $r$  and  $\bar{r}^{i,j}$  to a common upper bound of  $\bar{p}^i, \bar{p}^j$  in  $\bar{Q}[\bar{b}]$ .

■

**Claim 3.9.** *If  $e = 0, 1$  and  $\delta$  is a limit ordinal, and  $P_i, \mathcal{Q}_i, \alpha_i, e_i^* (i < \delta)$  are such that for each  $\alpha < \delta$ ,  $\bar{Q}^\alpha = \langle P_i, \mathcal{Q}_j, \alpha_j, e_j^* : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{K}^\ell$ , then for a unique  $P_\delta, \bar{Q} = \langle P_i, \mathcal{Q}_j, \alpha_j, e_j^* : i \leq \delta, j < \delta \rangle$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{K}^\ell$ .*

**Proof.** We define  $P_\delta$  by (d) of Definition 3.4. The least easy problem is to verify the Knaster conditions (for  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}^1$ ). The proof is like the preservation of the c.c.c. under iteration for limit stages. ■

**Convention 3.9A.** *By 3.9 we shall not distinguish strictly between  $\langle P_i, \mathcal{Q}_j, \alpha_j, e_j^* : i \leq \delta, j < \delta \rangle$  and  $\langle P_i, \mathcal{Q}_i, \alpha_i, e_i^* : i < \delta \rangle$ .*

**Claim 3.10.** *If  $\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}^\ell$ ,  $\alpha = \text{lg}(\bar{Q})$ ,  $a < \alpha$  is closed for  $\bar{Q}$ ,  $|a| \leq \aleph_1$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  is a  $P_a^{\text{cn}}$ -name of a forcing notion satisfying (in  $V^{P_a}$ ) the Knaster condition, its underlying set is a subset of  $[\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0}$  then there is a unique  $\bar{Q}^1 \in \mathfrak{K}^\ell$ ,  $\text{lg}(\bar{Q}^1) = \alpha + 1$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^1 = \mathcal{Q}$ ,  $\bar{Q} \restriction \alpha = \bar{Q}^1$ .*

**Proof.** Left to the reader. ■

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.**

**A Stage:** We force by  $\mathfrak{K}_{<\lambda}^1 = \{\bar{Q} \in \mathfrak{K}^1 : \text{lg}(\bar{Q}) < \lambda, \bar{Q} \in H(\lambda)\}$  ordered by being an initial segment (which is equivalent to forcing a Cohen subset of  $\lambda$ ). The generic object is essentially  $\bar{Q}^* \in \mathfrak{K}_\lambda^1$ ,  $\text{lg}(\bar{Q}^*) = \lambda$ , and then we force by  $P_\lambda = \lim \bar{Q}^*$ . Clearly  $\mathfrak{K}_{<\lambda}^\ell$  is a  $\lambda$ -complete forcing notion of cardinality  $\lambda$ , and  $P_\lambda$  satisfies the c.c.c. Clearly it suffices to prove part (2) of 3.1.

Suppose  $\underline{d}_n$  is a name of a function from  $[\lambda]^n$  to  $k_n$  for  $n < \omega$ ,  $\varrho_n < \omega$ ,  $\langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$  diverges (i.e.  $\forall m \exists k \forall n \geq k \sigma_n \geq m$ ) and for some  $\bar{Q}^0 \in \mathfrak{K}_{<\lambda}^1$ .

$\bar{Q}^0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{K}_{<\lambda}^1}$  “there is  $p \in P_\lambda$  [ $p \Vdash_{P_\lambda} \langle \underline{d}_n : n < \omega \rangle$  is a counterexample to (2) of 3.1]”.

In  $V$  we can define  $\langle \bar{Q}^\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ ,  $\bar{Q}^\zeta \in \mathfrak{K}_{<\lambda}^1$ ,  $\zeta < \xi \Rightarrow \bar{Q}^\zeta = \bar{Q}^\xi \restriction \text{lg}(\bar{Q}^\zeta)$ , in  $\bar{Q}^{\zeta+1}$ ,  $e_{\text{lg}(\bar{Q}^\zeta)}^* = 1$ ,  $\bar{Q}^{\zeta+1}$  forces (in  $\mathfrak{K}_{<\lambda}^1$ ) a value to  $p$  and the  $P_\lambda$ -names  $\underline{d}_n \restriction \zeta$ ,  $\varrho_n$ ,  $k_n$  for  $n < \omega$ , i.e. the values here are still  $P_\lambda$ -names. Let  $\bar{Q}^*$  be the limit of the  $\bar{Q}^\xi$ -s. So  $\bar{Q}^* \in \mathfrak{K}^1$ ,  $\text{lg}(\bar{Q}^*) = \lambda$ ,  $\bar{Q}^* = \langle P_i^*, Q_j^*, \alpha_j^*, e_j^* : i \leq \lambda, j < \lambda \rangle$ , and the  $P_\lambda^*$ -names  $\underline{d}_n$ ,  $\varrho_n$ ,  $k_n$  are defined such that in  $V^{P_\lambda^*}$ ,  $\underline{d}_n$ ,  $\varrho_n$ ,  $k_n$  contradict (2) (as any  $P_\lambda^*$ -name of a bounded subset of  $\lambda$  is a  $P_{\text{lg}(\bar{Q}^\xi)}^*$ -name for some  $\xi < \lambda$ ).

**B Stage:** Let  $\chi = \kappa^+$  and  $<_\chi^*$  be a well-ordering of  $H(\chi)$ . Now we can apply  $\lambda \rightarrow (\omega_1)_2^{<\omega}$  to get  $\delta, B, N_s$  (for  $s \in [B]^{<\aleph_0}$ ) and  $\mathbf{h}_{s,t}$  (for  $s, t \in [B]^{<\aleph_0}$ ,  $|s| = |t|$ ) such that:

- (a)  $B \subseteq \lambda$ ,  $\text{otp}(B) = \omega_1$ ,  $\sup B = \delta$ ,
- (b)  $N_s \prec (H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ ,  $\bar{Q}^* \in N_s$ ,  $\langle \underline{d}_n, \varrho_n, k_n : n < \omega \rangle \in N_s$ ,
- (c)  $N_s \cap N_t = N_{s \cap t}$ ,
- (d)  $N_s \cap B = s$ ,
- (e) if  $s = t \cap \alpha$ ,  $t \in [B]^{<\aleph_0}$  then  $N_s \cap \lambda$  is an initial segment of  $N_t$ ,
- (f)  $\mathbf{h}_{s,t}$  is an isomorphism from  $N_t$  onto  $N_s$  (when defined)
- (g)  $\mathbf{h}_{t,s} = \mathbf{h}_{s,t}^{-1}$
- (h)  $p_0 \in N_s$ ,  $p_0 \Vdash_{P_\lambda}$  “ $\langle \underline{d}_n, \varrho_n, k_n : n < \omega \rangle$  is a counterexample”,
- (i)  $\omega_1 \subseteq N_s$ ,  $|N_s| = \aleph_1$  and if  $\gamma \in N_s$ ,  $\text{cf } \gamma > \aleph_1$  then  $\text{cf}(\sup(\gamma \cap N_s)) = \omega_1$ .

Let  $\bar{Q} = \bar{Q}^* \upharpoonright \delta$ ,  $P = P_\delta^*$  and  $P_a = P_a^{\text{cn}}$  (for  $\bar{Q}$ ), where  $a$  is closed for  $\bar{Q}$ . Note:  $P_\lambda^* \cap N_s = P_\delta^* \cap N_s = P_{\sup \lambda \cap N_s} \cap N_s = P_s \cap N_s$ . Note also  $\gamma \in \lambda \cap N_s \Rightarrow a_\gamma^* \subseteq \lambda \cap N_s$ .

**C Stage:** It suffices to show that we can define  $Q_\delta$  in  $V^{P_\delta}$  which forces a subset  $W$  of  $B$  of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  and  $\bar{F} : W \rightarrow {}^{\omega_2}_\delta$  which exemplify the desired conclusion in (2), and prove that  $Q_\delta$  satisfies the  $\aleph_1$ -c.c.c. (in  $V^{P_\delta}$  (and has cardinality  $\aleph_1$ )) and moreover (see Definitions 3.4 and 3.7(3)) we also define  $a_\delta = \bigcup_{s \in [B]^{<\aleph_0}} N_s$ ,  $e_\delta = 1$ ,  $\bar{Q}' = \bar{Q} \wedge \langle P_\delta^*, Q_\delta, a_\delta, e_\delta \rangle$  and prove  $\bar{Q}' \in \mathfrak{K}^1$ .

We let  $\bar{d}(u) = \bar{d}_{|u|}(u)$ .

Let  $F : \omega_1 \rightarrow {}^{\omega_2}_\delta$  be one-to-one such that  $\forall \eta \in {}^{\omega_1}_{>2} \exists \aleph_1 \alpha < \omega_1 [\eta \triangleleft F(\alpha)]$ . (This will not be the needed  $\bar{F}$ , just notation).

For  $s, t \in [B]^{<\aleph_0}$ , we say  $s \equiv_F^n t$  if  $|s| = |t|$  and  $\forall \xi \in s, \forall \zeta \in t [\xi = \mathbf{h}_{s,t}(\zeta) \Rightarrow F(\xi) \upharpoonright n = F(\zeta) \upharpoonright n]$ . Let  $I_n = I_n(F) = \{s \in [B]^{<\aleph_0} : (\forall \zeta \neq \xi \in s), [F(\zeta) \upharpoonright n \neq F(\xi) \upharpoonright n]\}$ .

We define  $R_n$  as follows: a sequence  $\langle p_s : s \in I_n \rangle \in R_n$  if and only if

- (i) for  $s \in I_n$ ,  $p_s \in P_\lambda^* \cap N_s$ ,
- (ii) for some  $c_s$  we have  $p_s \Vdash " \bar{d}(s) = c_s "$ ,
- (iii) for  $s, t \in I_n$ ,  $s \equiv_F^n t \Rightarrow \mathbf{h}_{s,t}(p_t) = p_s$ ,
- (iv) for  $s, t \in I_n$ ,  $p_s \upharpoonright N_{s \cap t} = p_t \upharpoonright N_{s \cap t}$ .

$R_n^-$  is defined similarly omitting (ii).

For  $x = \langle p_s : s \in I_n \rangle$  let  $n(x) = n$ ,  $p_s^x = p_s$ , and (if defined)  $c_s^x = c_s$ . Note that we could replace  $x \in R_n$  by a finite subsequence. Let  $R = \bigcup_{n < \omega} R_n$ ,  $R^- = \bigcup_{n < \omega} R_n^-$ . We define an order on  $R^-$ :  $x \leq y$  if and only if  $n(x) \leq n(y)$ , and  $[s \in I_{n(x)} \wedge t \in I_{n(y)} \wedge s \subseteq t \Rightarrow p_s^x \leq p_t^y]$ .

**D Stage:** Note the following facts::

**D( $\alpha$ ) Subfact:** If  $x \in R_n^-$ ,  $t \in I_n$  and  $p_t^x \leq p^1 \in P_\delta^* \cap N_t$ , then there is  $y$  such that  $x \leq y \in R_n^-$ ,  $p_t^y = p^1$ .

**Proof.** We let for  $s \in I_n$

$$p_s^y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \& \{ \mathbf{h}_{s_1, t_1}(p^1 \upharpoonright N_{t_1}) : s_1 \subseteq s, t_1 \subseteq t, s_1 \equiv_F^n t_1 \} \& p_s^x.$$

(This notation means that  $p_s^y$  is a function whose domain is the union of the domains of the conditions mentioned, and for each coordinate we take the canonical upper bound, see preliminaries.) Why is  $p_s^y$  well defined?

Suppose  $\beta \in N_s \cap \lambda$  (for  $\beta \in \lambda \setminus N_s$ , clearly  $p_s^y(\beta) = \emptyset_\beta$ ),  $s_\ell \subseteq s$ ,  $t_\ell \subseteq t$ ,  $s_\ell \equiv_F^n t_\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $\beta \in \text{Dom} \left[ \mathbf{h}_{s_\ell, t_\ell}(p^1 \upharpoonright N_{t_\ell}) \right]$ , and it suffices to show that  $p_s^x(\beta)$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_{s_1, t_1}(p^1 \upharpoonright N_{t_1})(\beta)$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_{s_2, t_2}(p^1 \upharpoonright N_{t_2})(\beta)$  are pairwise comparable. Let  $u = \bigcap \{v \in [B]^{<\aleph_0} : \beta \in N_v\}$ , necessarily  $u \subseteq s_1 \cap s_2$ , and let  $u_\ell = \mathbf{h}_{s_\ell, t_\ell}^{-1}(u)$ . As  $s_\ell, t_\ell, t \in I_n$ ,  $s_\ell \equiv_F^n t_\ell$  and  $u_\ell \subseteq t_\ell \subseteq t$ , necessarily  $u_1 = u_2$ . Thus  $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{h}_{u, v}^{-1}(\beta) = \mathbf{h}_{s_\ell, t_\ell}^{-1}(\beta)$  and so the last two conditions are equal.

Now  $p_s^x(\beta) = p_u^x(\beta) = \mathbf{h}_{u, v}(p_s^x(\gamma)) \leq \mathbf{h}_{s_\ell, t_\ell}((p_t^x \upharpoonright N_{t_\ell})(\gamma)) = \left( \mathbf{h}_{s_\ell, t_\ell}(p_t^x \upharpoonright N_{t_\ell}) \right)(\beta)$ .

We leave to the reader checking the other requirements. ■

**D( $\beta$ ) Subfact:** If  $x \in R_n^-$ ,  $t \in I$  then  $\bigcup \{p_s^x : s \in I_n, s \subseteq t\}$  (as union of functions) exists and belongs to  $P_\lambda^* \cap N_t$ .

**Proof.** See (iv) in the definition of  $R_n^-$ . ■

**D( $\gamma$ ) Subfact:** If  $x \leq y$ ,  $x \in R_n$ ,  $y \in R_n^-$ , then  $y \in R_n$ .

**Proof.** Check it. ■

**D( $\delta$ ) Subfact:** If  $x \in R_n^-$ ,  $n < m$ , then there is  $y \in R_m$ ,  $x \leq y$ .

**Proof.** By subfact D( $\beta$ ) we can find  $x^1 = \langle p_t^1 : t \in I_m \rangle \in \text{in} R_m^-$  with  $x \leq x^1$ . Using repeatedly subfact D( $\alpha$ ) we can increase  $x^1$  (finitely many times) to get  $y \in R_m$ . ■

**D( $\varepsilon$ ) Subfact:** If  $x \in R_n^-$ ,  $s, t \in I_n$ ,  $s \equiv_F^n t$ ,  $p_s^x \leq r_1 \in P_\lambda^* \cap N_s$ ,  $p_t^x \leq r_2 \in P_\lambda^* \cap N_t$ ,  $(\forall \zeta \in t) [F(\zeta)(n) \neq (F(\mathbf{h}_{s, t}(\zeta)))(n)]$  (or just  $p_{s_1}^x \upharpoonright s_1 = \mathbf{h}_{s, t}(p_{t_1}^x \upharpoonright t_1)$  where  $t_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\xi \in t : F(\xi)(n) = (F(\mathbf{h}_{s, t}(\xi)))(n)\}$ ,  $s_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{h}_{s, t}(\xi) : \xi \in t_1\}$ ), then there is  $y \in R_{n+1}$ ,  $x \leq y$  such that  $r_1 = p_s^y$  and  $r_2 = p_t^y$ .

**Proof.** Left to the reader. ■

**E Stage  $\dagger$  :**

---

$\dagger$  We will have  $T \subset {}^{\omega > 2}$  gotten by 2.7(2) and then want to get a subtree with as few as possible colors, we can find one isomorphic to  ${}^{\omega > 2}$ , and there restrict ourselves to  $\cup_n T_n^*$ .



We define:  $T_k^* \subseteq {}^{2^k}\geq 2$  by induction on  $k$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} T_0^* &= \{\langle \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle\} \\ T_{k+1}^* &= \{\nu : \nu \in T_k^* \text{ or } 2^k < \lg(\nu) \leq 2^{k+1}, \nu \restriction 2^k \in T_k^* \text{ and} \\ &\quad [2^k \leq i < 2^{k+1} \wedge \nu(i) = 1] \Rightarrow i = 2^k + (\sum_{m < 2^k} \nu(i) 2^m)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr Emb}(k, n) &= \left\{ h : h \text{ a is function from } T_k^* \text{ into } {}^{n \geq 2} \text{ such that} \right. \\ &\quad \text{for } \nu, \rho \in T_k^* : \\ &\quad [\eta = \nu \Leftrightarrow h(\eta) = h(\nu)] \\ &\quad [\eta \triangleleft \nu \Leftrightarrow h(\eta) \triangleleft h(\nu)] \\ &\quad [\lg(\eta) = \lg(\nu) \Rightarrow \lg(h(\eta)) = \lg(h(\nu))] \\ &\quad [\nu = \eta \hat{\ } \langle i \rangle \Rightarrow (h(\nu))[\lg(h(\eta))] = i] \\ &\quad \left. [\lg(\eta) = {}^k 2 \Rightarrow \lg(h(\eta)) = n] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{T}(k, n) = \{\text{Rang } h : h \in \text{Tr Emb}(k, n)\},$$

$$\mathbf{T}(*, n) = \bigcup_k \mathbf{T}(k, n),$$

$$\mathbf{T}(k, *) = \bigcup_k \mathbf{T}(k, n).$$

For  $T \in \mathbf{T}(k, *)$  let  $n(T)$  be the unique  $n$  such that  $T \in \mathbf{T}(k, n)$  and let

$$\begin{aligned} B_T &= \{\alpha \in B : F(\alpha) \restriction n(T) \text{ is a maximal member of } T\}, \\ f s_T &= \left\{ t \subseteq B_T : \eta \in t \wedge \nu \in t \wedge \eta \neq \nu \Rightarrow \eta \restriction n(T) \neq \nu \restriction n(T) \right\}, \\ \Theta_T &= \left\{ \langle p_s : s \in f s_T \rangle : p_s \in P \cap N_s, [s \subseteq t \wedge \{s, t\} \subseteq f s_T \Rightarrow p_s = p_t \restriction N_s] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let further

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_k &= \bigcup \{\Theta_T : T \in \mathbf{T}(k, *)\} \\ \Theta &= \bigcup_k \Theta_k. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\bar{p} \in \Theta$ ,  $\mathbf{n}_{\bar{p}} = \mathbf{n}(\bar{p})$ ,  $T_{\bar{p}}$  are defined naturally.

For  $\bar{p}, \bar{q} \in \Theta$ ,  $\bar{p} \leq \bar{q}$  iff  $\mathbf{n}_{\bar{p}} \leq \mathbf{n}_{\bar{q}}$  and for every  $s \in f_{s_{T_{\bar{p}}}}$  we have  $p_s \leq q_s$ .

**F Stage:** Let  $g : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ ,  $g \in N_s$ ,  $g$  grows fast enough relative  $\langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ . We define a game Gm. A play of the game lasts after  $\omega$  moves, in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  move player I chooses  $\bar{p}^n \in \Theta_n$  and a function  $h_n$  satisfying the restrictions below and then player II chooses  $\bar{q}_n \in \Theta_n$ , such that  $\bar{p}_n \leq \bar{q}_n$  (so  $T_{\bar{p}_n} = T_{\bar{q}_n}$ ). Player I loses the play if sometimes he has no legal move; if he never loses, he wins. The restrictions player I has to satisfy are:

- (a) for  $m < n$ ,  $\bar{q}_m \leq \bar{p}_n$ ,  $p_s^n$  forces a value to  $g \upharpoonright (n+1)$ ,
- (b)  $h_n$  is a function from  $[B_{T_{\bar{p}_n}}]^{\leq g(n)}$  to  $\omega$ ,
- (c) if  $m < n \Rightarrow h_m, h_n$  are compatible,
- (d) If  $m < n$ ,  $\ell < g(m)$ ,  $s \in [B_{T_{\bar{p}_n}}]^\ell$ , then  $p_s^n \Vdash d(s) = h_n(s)$ ,
- (e) Let  $s_1, s_2 \in \text{Dom } h_n$ . Then  $h_n(s_1) = h_n(s_2)$  whenever  $s_1, s_2$  are similar over  $n$  which means:

- (i)  $\left( F \left( H_{s_2, s_1}^{OP}(\zeta) \right) \right) \upharpoonright \mathbf{n}[\bar{p}^n] = \left( F(\zeta) \right) \upharpoonright \mathbf{n}[\bar{p}^n]$  for  $\zeta \in s_1$ ,
- (ii)  $H_{s_2, s_1}^{OP}$  preserves the relations  $\text{sp} \left( F(\zeta_1), F(\zeta_2) \right) < \text{sp} \left( F(\zeta_3), F(\zeta_4) \right)$  and  $F(\zeta_3) \left( \text{sp} \left( F(\zeta_1), F(\zeta_2) \right) \right) = i$  (in the interesting case  $\zeta_3 \neq \zeta_1, \zeta_2$  implies  $i = 0$ ).

**G Stage/Claim:** Player I has a winning strategy in this game.

**Proof.** As the game is closed, it is determined, so we assume player II has a winning strategy, and eventually we shall get a contradiction. We define by induction on  $n$ ,  $\bar{r}^n$  and  $\Phi^n$  such that

- (a)  $\bar{r}^n \in R_n$ ,  $\bar{r}^n \leq \bar{r}^{n+1}$ ,
- (b)  $\Phi^n$  is a finite set of initial segments of plays of the game,
- (c) in each member of  $\Phi^n$  player II uses his winning strategy,
- (d) if  $y$  belongs to  $\Phi^n$  then it has the form  $\langle \bar{p}^{y, \ell}, h^{y, \ell}, \bar{q}^{y, \ell} : \ell \leq m(y) \rangle$ ; let  $h_y = h^{y, n_y}$  and  $T_y = T_{\bar{q}^y, m(y)}$ ; also  $T_y \subseteq^{n \geq} 2$ ,  $q_s^{y, \ell} \leq r_s^n$  for  $s \in f_{s_{T_y}}$ .
- (e)  $\Phi_n \subseteq \Phi_{n+1}$ ,  $\Phi_n$  is closed under taking the initial segments and the empty sequence (which too is an initial segment of a play) belongs to  $\Phi_0$ .
- (f) For any  $y \in \Phi_n$  and  $T, h$  either for some  $z \in \Phi_{n+1}$ ,  $n_z = n_y + 1$ ,  $y = z \upharpoonright (n_y + 1)$ ,  $T_z = T$  and  $h_z = h$  or player I has no legal  $(n_y + 1)^{\text{th}}$  move  $\bar{p}^n, h^n$  (after  $y$  was played) such that  $T_{\bar{p}^n} = T$ ,  $h^n = h$ , and  $p_s^n = r_s^n$  for  $s \in f_{s_T}$  (or always  $\leq$  or always  $\geq$ ).

There is no problem to carry the definition. Now  $\langle \bar{r}_s^n : n < \omega \rangle$  define a function  $d^*$ : if  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k \in {}^m 2$  are distinct then  $d^*(\langle \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k \rangle) = c$  iff for every (equivalently some)  $\zeta_1 < \dots < \zeta_k$  from  $B$ ,  $\eta_\ell \triangleleft F(\zeta_\ell)$  and  $r_{\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k\}}^k \Vdash "d_k(\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k\}) = c"$ .

Now apply 2.7(2) to this coloring, get  $T^* \subseteq {}^\omega 2$  as there. Now player I could have chosen initial segments of this  $T^*$  (in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  move in  $\Phi_n$ ) and we get easily a contradiction. ■

**H Stage:** We fix a winning strategy for player I (whose existence is guaranteed by stage G).

We define a forcing notion  $Q^*$ . We have  $(r, y, f) \in Q^*$  iff

- (i)  $r \in P_{a_\delta}^{\text{cn}}$
- (ii)  $y = \langle \bar{p}^\ell, h^\ell, \bar{q}^\ell : \ell \leq m(y) \rangle$  is an initial segment of a play of  $\underline{\text{Gm}}$  in which player I uses his winning strategy
- (iii)  $f$  is a finite function from  $B$  to  $\{0, 1\}$  such that  $f^{-1}(\{1\}) \in fs_{T_y}$  (where  $T_y = T_{\bar{q}^{m(y)}}$ ).
- (iv)  $r = q_{f^{-1}(\{1\})}^{y, m(y)}$ .

The *Order* is the natural one.

**I Stage:** If  $\underline{J} \subseteq P_{a_\delta}^{\text{cn}}$  is dense open then  $\{(r, y, f) \in Q^* : r \in \underline{J}\}$  is dense in  $Q^*$ .

**Proof.** By 3.8(1) (by the appropriate renaming). ■

**J Stage:** We define  $Q_\delta$  in  $V^{P_\delta}$  as  $\{(r, y, f) \in Q^* : r \in G_{P_\delta}\}$ , the order is as in  $Q^*$ .

The main point left is to prove the Knaster condition for the partial ordered set  $\bar{Q}^* = \bar{Q} \wedge \langle P_\delta, Q_\delta, a_\delta, e_\delta \rangle$  demanded in the definition of  $\mathfrak{K}^1$ . This will follow by 3.8(3) (after you choose meaning and renamings) as done in stages K, L below.

**K Stage:** So let  $i < \delta$ ,  $\text{cf}(i) \neq \aleph_1$ , and we shall prove that  $P_{\delta+1}^+ / P_i$  satisfies the Knaster condition. Let  $p_\alpha \in P_{\delta+1}^*$  for  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , and we should find  $p \in P_i$ ,  $p \Vdash_{P_i}$  "there is an unbounded  $A \subseteq \{\alpha : p_\alpha \restriction i \in G_{P_i}\}$  such that for any  $\alpha, \beta \in A$ ,  $p_\alpha, p_\beta$  are compatible in  $P_{\delta+1}^* / G_{P_i}$ ".

Without loss of generality:

- (a)  $p_\alpha \in P_{\delta+1}^{\text{cn}}$ .

(b) for some  $\langle i_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$  increasing continuous with limit  $\delta$  we have:  
 $i_0 > i$ , cf  $i_\alpha \neq \aleph_1$ ,  $p_\alpha \restriction \delta \in P_{i_{\alpha+1}}$ ,  $p_\alpha \restriction i_\alpha \in P_{i_0}$ .

Let  $p_\alpha^0 = p^\alpha \restriction i_0$ ,  $p_\alpha^1 = p_\alpha \restriction \delta = p_\alpha \restriction i_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $p_\alpha(\delta) = (r_\alpha, y_\alpha, f_\alpha)$ , so without loss of generality

- (c)  $r_\alpha \in P_{i_{\alpha+1}}$ ,  $r_\alpha \restriction i_\alpha \in P_{i_0}$ ,  $m(y_\alpha) = m^*$ ,
- (d)  $\text{Dom } f_\alpha \subseteq i_0 \cup [i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1})$ ,
- (e)  $f_\alpha \restriction i_0$  is constant (remember  $\text{otp}(B) = \omega_1$ ,
- (f) if  $\text{Dom } f_\alpha = \{j_0^\alpha, \dots, j_{k_\alpha-1}^\alpha\}$  then  $k_\alpha = k$ ,  $[j_\ell^\alpha < i_\alpha \Leftrightarrow \ell < k^*]$ ,  
 $\bigwedge_{\ell < k^*} j_\ell^\alpha = j_\ell^\beta$ ,  $f(j_\ell^\alpha) = f(j_\ell^\beta)$ ,  $F(j_\ell^\alpha) \restriction m(y_\alpha) = F(j_\ell^\beta) \restriction m(y_\beta)$ .

The main problem is the compatibility of the  $q^{y_\alpha, m(y_\alpha)}$ . Now by the definition  $\Theta_\alpha$  (in stage E) and 3.8(3) this holds. ■

**L Stage:** If  $c \subset \delta + 1$  is closed for  $\bar{Q}^*$ , then  $P_{\delta+1}^*/P_c^{cn}$  satisfies the Knaster condition.

If  $c$  is bounded in  $\delta$ , choose a successor  $i \in (\sup c, \delta)$  for  $\bar{Q} \restriction i \in \mathfrak{K}_1$ . We know that  $P_i/P_c^{cn}$  satisfies the Knaster condition and by stage K,  $P_{\delta+1}^*/P_i$  also satisfies the Knaster condition; as it is preserved by composition we have finished the stage.

So assume  $c$  is unbounded in  $\delta$  and it is easy too. So as seen in stage J, we have finished the proof of 3.1. ■

**Theorem 3.11.** *If  $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$ ,  $P$  is the forcing notion of adding  $\lambda$  Cohen reals then*

- (\*)<sub>1</sub> *in  $V^P$ , if  $n < \omega$   $d : [\lambda]^{\leq n} \rightarrow \sigma$ ,  $\sigma < \aleph_0$ , then for some c.c.c. forcing notion  $Q$  we have  $\Vdash_Q$  “there are an uncountable  $A \subseteq \lambda$  and an one-to-one  $F : A \rightarrow {}^\omega 2$  such that  $d$  is  $F$ -canonical on  $A$ ” (see notation in §2).*
- (\*)<sub>2</sub> *if in  $V$ ,  $\lambda \geq \mu \rightarrow_{\text{wsp}} (\kappa)_{\aleph_0}$  (see [Sh289]) and in  $V^P$ ,  $d : [\mu]^{\leq n} \rightarrow \sigma$ ,  $\sigma < \aleph_0$  then in  $V^P$  for some c.c.c. forcing notion  $Q$  we have  $\Vdash_Q$  “there are  $A \in [\mu]^\kappa$  and one-to-one  $F : A \rightarrow {}^\omega 2$  such that  $d$  is  $F$ -canonical on  $A$ ” (see §2, ).*
- (\*)<sub>3</sub> *if in  $V$ ,  $\lambda \geq \mu \rightarrow_{\text{wsp}} (\aleph_1)_{\aleph_2}^n$  and in  $V^P$   $d : [\mu]^{\leq n} \rightarrow \sigma$ ,  $\sigma < \aleph_0$  then in  $V^P$  for every  $\alpha < \omega_1$  and  $F : \alpha \rightarrow {}^\omega 2$  for some  $A \subseteq \mu$  of order type  $\alpha$  and  $F' : A \rightarrow {}^\omega 2$ ,  $F'(\beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\text{otp}(A \cap \beta))$ ,  $d$  is  $F'$ -canonical on  $A$ .*
- (\*)<sub>4</sub> *in  $V^P$ ,  $2^{\aleph_0} \rightarrow (\alpha, n)^3$  for every  $\alpha < \omega_1$ ,  $n < \omega$ . Really, assuming  $V \models \text{GCH}$ , we have  $\aleph_{n+1} \rightarrow (\alpha, n)$  see [Sh289].*

**Proof.** Similar to the proof of 3.1. Superficially we need more indiscernibility then we get, but getting  $\langle M_u : u \in [B]^{\leq n} \rangle$  we ignore  $d(\{\alpha, \beta\})$  when there is no  $u$  with  $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in M_u$ .

**Theorem 3.12.** *If  $\lambda$  is strongly inaccessible  $\omega$ -Mahlo,  $\mu < \lambda$ , then for some c.c.c. forcing notion  $P$  of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,  $V^P$  satisfies*

- (a)  $MA_\mu$
- (b)  $2^{\aleph_0} = \lambda = 2^\kappa$  for  $\kappa < \lambda$
- (c)  $\lambda \rightarrow [\aleph_1]_{\sigma, h(n)}^n$  for  $n < \omega$ ,  $\sigma < \aleph_0$ ,  $h(n)$  is as in 3.1.

**Proof.** Again, like 3.1.

#### 4. Partition theorem for trees on large cardinals

**Lemma 4.1** *Suppose  $\mu > \sigma + \aleph_0$  and*

$(*)_\mu$  *for every  $\mu$ -complete forcing notion  $P$ , in  $V^P$ ,  $\mu$  is measurable.*

*Then*

- (1) *for  $n < \omega$ ,  $Pr_{eht}^f(\mu, n, \sigma)$ .*
- (2)  *$Pr_{eht}^f(\mu, < \aleph_0, \sigma)$ , if there is  $\lambda > \mu$ ,  $\lambda \rightarrow (\mu^+)_2^{<\omega}$ .*
- (3) *In both cases we can have the  $Pr_{ehtn}^f$  version, and even choose the  $\langle <_\alpha^* : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  in any of the following ways.*
  - (a) *We are given  $\langle <_\alpha^0 : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ , and we let for  $\eta, \nu \in {}^\alpha 2 \cap T$ ,  $\alpha \in SP(T)$  ( $T$  is the subtree we consider):*

$$\eta <_\alpha^* \nu \text{ if and only if } \text{clp}_T(\eta) <_\beta^0 \text{clp}_T(\nu) \text{ where } \beta = \text{otp}(\alpha \cap SP(T))$$
*and  $\text{clp}_T(\eta) = \langle \eta(j) : j \in \text{lg}(\eta), j \in SP(T) \rangle$ .*
  - (b) *We are given  $\langle <_\alpha^0 : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ , we let that for  $\nu, \eta \in {}^\alpha 2 \cap T$ ,  $\alpha \in SP(T)$ :*

$$\eta <_\alpha^* \nu \text{ if and only if } n \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) <_{\beta+1}^0 \nu \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) \text{ where } \beta = \sup(\alpha \cap SP(T)).$$

**Remark.** 1)  $(*)_\mu$  holds for a supercompact after Laver treatment. On hypermeasurable see Gitik Shelah [GiSh344].

2) We can in  $(*)_\mu$  restrict ourselves to the forcing notion  $P$  actually used. For it by Gitik [Gi] much smaller large cardinals suffice.

3) The proof of 4.1 is a generalization of a proof of Harrington to Halpern Lauchli theorem from 1978.

**Conclusion 4.2.** In 4.1 we can get  $Pr_{ht}^f(\mu, n, \sigma)$  (even with (3)).

**Proof of 4.2.** We do the parallel to 4.1(1). By  $(*)_\mu$ ,  $\mu$  is weakly compact hence by 2.6(2) it is enough to prove  $Pr_{abt}^f(\mu, n, \sigma)$ . This follows from 4.1(1) by 2.6(1). ■

**Proof of Lemma 4.1.** 1), 2). Let  $\kappa \leq \omega$ ,  $\sigma(n) < \mu$ ,  $d_n \in \text{Col}_{\sigma(n)}^n(\mu^{>2})$  for  $n < \kappa$ .

Choose  $\lambda$  such that  $\lambda \rightarrow (\mu^+)_{2^\mu}^{<2\kappa}$  (there is such a  $\lambda$  by assumption for (2) and by  $\kappa < \omega$  for (1)). Let  $Q$  be the forcing notion  $(\mu^{>2}, \triangleleft)$ , and  $P = P_\lambda$  be  $\{f : \text{dom}(f) \text{ is a subset of } \lambda \text{ of cardinality } < \mu, f(i) \in Q\}$  ordered naturally. For  $i \notin \text{dom}(f)$ , take  $f(i) = \langle \rangle$ ; Let  $\eta_i$  be the  $P$ -name for  $\{f(i) : f \in G_P\}$ . Let  $\underline{D}$  be a  $P$ -name of a normal ultrafilter over  $\mu$  (in  $V^P$ ). For each  $n < \omega$ ,  $d \in \text{Col}_{\sigma(n)}^n(\mu^{>2})$ ,  $j < \sigma(n)$  and  $u = \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$ , where  $\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_{n-1} < \lambda$ , let  $\underline{A}_d^j(u)$  be the  $P_\lambda$ -name of the set

$$\underline{A}_d^j(u) = \left\{ i < \mu : \langle \eta_{\alpha_\ell} \restriction i : \ell < n \rangle \text{ are pairwise distinct and } \right. \\ \left. j = d(\eta_{\alpha_0} \restriction i, \dots, \eta_{\alpha_{n-1}} \restriction i) \right\}.$$

So  $\underline{A}_d^j(u)$  is a  $P_\lambda$ -name of a subset of  $\mu$ , and for  $j(1) < j(2) < \sigma(n)$  we have  $\Vdash_{P_\lambda} \text{"}\underline{A}_d^{j(1)}(u) \cap \underline{A}_d^{j(2)}(u) = \emptyset\text{"}$ , and  $\bigcup_{j < \sigma(n)} \underline{A}_d^j(u)$  is a co-bounded subset of  $\mu$ ". As  $\Vdash_P \text{"}\mathfrak{D} \text{ is } \mu\text{-complete uniform ultrafilter on } \mu\text{"}$ , in  $V^P$  there is exactly one  $j < \sigma(n)$  with  $\underline{A}_d^j(u) \in \mathfrak{D}$ . Let  $\underline{j}_d(u)$  be the  $P$ -name of this  $j$ .

Let  $I_d(u) \subseteq P$  be a maximal antichain of  $P$ , each member of  $I_d(u)$  forces a value to  $\underline{j}_d(u)$ . Let  $W_d(u) = \bigcup \{\text{dom}(p) : p \in I_d(u)\}$  and  $W(u) = \bigcup \{W_{d_n}(u) : n < \kappa\}$ . So  $W_d(u)$  is a subset of  $\lambda$  of cardinality  $\leq \mu$  as well as  $W(u)$  (as  $P$  satisfies the  $\mu^+$ -c.c. and  $p \in P \Rightarrow |\text{dom}(p)| < \mu$ ).

As  $\lambda \rightarrow (\mu^{++})_{2^\mu}^{<2\kappa}$ ,  $d_n \in \text{Col}_{\sigma(n)}^n(\mu^{>2})$  there is a subset  $Z$  of  $\lambda$  of cardinality  $\mu^{++}$  and set  $W^+(u)$  for each  $u \in [Z]^{<\kappa}$  such that:

- (i)  $W^+(u_1) \cap W^+(u_2) = W^+(u_1 \cap u_2)$ ,
- (ii)  $W(u) \subseteq W^+(u)$  if  $u \in [Z]^{<\kappa}$ ,
- (iii) if  $|u_1| = |u_2| < \kappa$  and  $u_1, u_2 \subseteq Z$  then  $W^+(u_1)$  and  $W^+(u_2)$  have the same order type and note that  $H[u_1, u_2] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_{W^+(u_1), W^+(u_2)}^{OP}$ , induces naturally a map from  $P \restriction u_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{p \in P : \text{dom}(p) \subseteq W^+(u_1)\}$  to  $P \restriction u_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{p \in P : \text{dom}(p) \subseteq W^+(u_2)\}$ .

- (iv) if  $u_1, u_2 \in [Z]^{<\kappa}$ ,  $|u_1| = |u_2|$  then  $H[u_1, u_2]$  maps  $I_{d_n}(u_1)$  onto  $I_{d_n}(u_2)$  and:  $q \Vdash "j_d(u_1) = j" \Leftrightarrow H[u_1, u_2](q) \Vdash "j_d(u_2) = j"$ ,
- (v) if  $u_1 \subseteq u_2 \in [Z]^{<\kappa}$ ,  $u_3 \subseteq u_4 \in [Z]^{<\kappa}$ ,  $|u_4| = |u_2|$ ,  $H_{u_2, u_4}^{OP}$  maps  $u_1$  onto  $u_3$  then  $H[u_1, u_3] \subseteq H[u_2, u_4]$ .

Let  $\gamma(i)$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  member of  $Z$ .

Let  $s(m)$  be the set of the first  $m$  members of  $Z$  and  $R_n = \{p \in P : \text{dom}(p) \subseteq W^+(s(n)) - \bigcup_{t \subseteq s(n)} W^+(t)\}$ .

We define by induction on  $\alpha < \mu$  a function  $F_\alpha$  and  $p_u \in R_{|u|}$  for  $u \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} [^\beta 2]^{<\kappa}$  where we let  $\emptyset_\beta$  be the empty subset of  $[^\beta 2]$  and we behave as if  $[\beta \neq \gamma \Rightarrow \emptyset_\beta \neq \emptyset_\gamma]$  and we also define  $\zeta(\beta) < \mu$ , such that:

- (i)  $F_\alpha$  is a function from  $^{>2}$  into  $^{>2}$ , extending  $F_\beta$  for  $\beta < \alpha$ ,
- (ii)  $F_\alpha$  maps  $^\beta 2$  to  $^{\zeta(\beta)} 2$  for some  $\zeta(\beta) < \mu$  and  $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \alpha \Rightarrow \zeta(\beta_1) < \zeta(\beta_2)$ ,
- (iii)  $\eta \triangleleft \nu \in ^{>2}$  implies  $F_\alpha(\eta) \triangleleft F_\alpha(\nu)$ ,
- (iv) for  $\eta \in ^\beta 2$ ,  $\beta + 1 < \alpha$  and  $\ell < 2$  we have  $F_\alpha(\eta)^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle \triangleleft F_\alpha(\eta^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle)$ ,
- (v)  $p_u \in R_m$  whenever  $u \in [^\beta 2]^m$ ,  $m < \kappa$ ,  $\beta < \alpha$  and for  $u(1) \in [Z]^m$  let  $p_{u, u(1)} = H[s(|u|), u(1)](p_u)$ .
- (vi)  $\eta \in ^\beta 2$ ,  $\beta < \alpha$ , then  $p_{\{\eta\}}(\min Z) = F_\alpha(\eta)$ .
- (vii) if  $\beta < \alpha$ ,  $u \in [^\beta 2]^n$ ,  $n < \kappa$ ,  $h : u \rightarrow s(n)$  one-to-one onto (not necessarily order preserving) then for some  $c(u, h) < \sigma(n)$ :

$$\bigcup_{t \subseteq u} p_{t, h''(t)} \Vdash_{P_\lambda} "d_n(\eta_{\gamma(0)}, \dots, \eta_{\gamma(n-1)}) = c(u, h)",$$

(Note: as  $p_u \in R_{|u|}$  the domains of the conditions in this union are pairwise disjoint.)

- (viii) If  $n, u, \beta, h$  are as in (vii),  $u = \{\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1}\}$ ,  $\nu_\ell \triangleleft \rho_\ell \in ^\gamma 2$ ,  $\beta \leq \gamma < \alpha$  then  $d_n(F_\alpha(\rho_0), \dots, F_\alpha(\rho_{n-1})) = c(u, h)$  where  $h$  is the unique function from  $u$  onto  $s(n)$  such that  $[h(\nu_\ell) \leq h(\nu_m) \Rightarrow \rho_\ell <_\gamma^* \rho_m]$ .
- (ix) if  $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$ ,  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \in ^\gamma 2$ ,  $n < \kappa$ , and  $\nu_0 \restriction \beta, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \restriction \beta$  are pairwise distinct then:

$$p_{\{\nu_0 \restriction \beta, \dots, \nu_n \restriction \beta\}} \subseteq p_{\{\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1}\}}.$$

For  $\alpha$  limit: no problem.

For  $\alpha + 1, \alpha$  limit: we try to define  $F_\alpha(\eta)$  for  $\eta \in ^\alpha 2$  such that  $\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} F_{\beta+1}(\eta \restriction \beta) \triangleleft F_\alpha(\eta)$  and (viii) holds. Let  $\zeta = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \zeta(\beta)$ , and for  $\eta \in ^\alpha 2$ ,  $F_\alpha^0(\eta) =$

$\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} F_\alpha(\eta \upharpoonright \beta)$  and for  $u \in [\alpha 2]^{<\kappa}$ ,  $p_u^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{p_{\{\nu \upharpoonright \beta : \nu \in u\}}^0 : \beta < \alpha, |u| = |\{\nu \upharpoonright \beta : \nu \in u\}|\}$ . Clearly  $p_u^0 \in R_{|u|}$ .

Then let  $h : {}^\alpha 2 \rightarrow Z$  be one-to-one, such that  $\eta <_\alpha^* \nu \Leftrightarrow h(\eta) < h(\nu)$  and let  $p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{p_{u, u(1)}^0 : u(1) \in [Z]^{<\kappa}, u \in [\alpha 2]^{<\kappa}, |u(1)| = |u|, h''(u) = u(1)\}$ .

For any generic  $G \subseteq P_\lambda$  to which  $p$  belongs,  $\beta < \alpha$  and ordinals  $i_0 < \dots < i_{n-1}$  from  $Z$  such that  $\langle h^{-1}(i_\ell) \upharpoonright \beta : \ell < n \rangle$  are pairwise distinct we have that

$$B_{\{i_\ell : \ell < n\}, \beta} = \left\{ \xi < \mu : d_n(\eta_{i_0} \upharpoonright \xi, \dots, \eta_{i_{n-1}} \upharpoonright \xi) = c(u, h^*) \right\},$$

belongs to  $\mathfrak{D}[G]$ , where  $u = \{h^{-1}(i_\ell) \upharpoonright \beta : \ell < n\}$  and  $h^* : u \rightarrow s(|u|)$  is defined by  $h^*(h^{-1}(i_\ell) \upharpoonright \beta) = H_{\{i_\ell : \ell < n\}, s(n)}^{OP}(i_\ell)$ . Really every large enough  $\beta < \mu$  can serve so we omit it. As  $\mathfrak{D}[G]$  is  $\mu$ -complete uniform ultrafilter on  $\mu$ , we can find  $\xi \in (\zeta, \kappa)$  such that  $\xi \in B_u$  for every  $u \in [\alpha 2]^n$ ,  $n < \kappa$ . We let for  $\nu \in {}^\alpha 2$ ,  $F_\alpha(\nu) = \eta_{h(i)}[G] \upharpoonright \xi$ , and we let  $p_u = p_u^0$  except when  $u = \{\nu\}$ , then:

$$p_u(i) = \begin{cases} p_u^0(i) & i \neq \gamma(0) \\ F_{\alpha+1}(\nu) & i = \gamma(0) \end{cases}.$$

For  $\alpha + 1$ ,  $\alpha$  is a successor: First for  $\eta \in {}^{\alpha-1} 2$  define  $F(\eta^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle) = F_\alpha(\eta)^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle$ . Next we let  $\{(u_i, h_i) : i < i^*\}$ , list all pairs  $(u, h)$ ,  $u \in [\alpha 2]^{\leq n}$ ,  $h : u \rightarrow s(|u|)$ , one-to-one onto. Now, we define by induction on  $i \leq i^*$ ,  $p_u^i(u \in [\alpha 2]^{<\kappa})$  such that :

- (a)  $p_u^i \in R_{|u|}$ ,
- (b)  $p_u^i$  increases with  $i$ ,
- (c) for  $i + 1$ , (vii) holds for  $(u_i, h_i)$ ,
- (d) if  $\nu_m \in {}^\alpha 2$  for  $m < n$ ,  $n < \kappa$ ,  $\langle \nu_m \upharpoonright (\alpha - 1) : m < n \rangle$  are pairwise distinct, then  $p_{\{\nu_m \upharpoonright (\alpha - 1) : m < n\}} \leq p_{\{\nu_m : m < n\}}^0$ ,
- (e) if  $\nu \in {}^\alpha 2$ ,  $\nu(\alpha - 1) = \ell$  then  $p_{\{\nu\}}^0(0) = F_\alpha(\nu \upharpoonright (\alpha - 1))^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle$ .

There is no problem to carry the induction.

Now  $F_{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright {}^\alpha 2$  is to be defined as in the second case, starting with  $\eta \rightarrow p_{\{\eta\}}^{i^*}(\eta)$ .

For  $\alpha = 0, 1$ : Left to the reader.

So we have finished the induction hence the proof of 4.1(1), (2).

3) Left to the reader ( the only influence is the choice of  $h$  in stage of the induction). ■



## 5. Somewhat complimentary negative partition relation in ZFC

The negative results here suffice to show that the value we have for  $2^{\aleph_0}$  in §3 is reasonable. In particular the Galvin conjecture is wrong and that for every  $n < \omega$  for some  $m < \omega$ ,  $\aleph_n \not\rightarrow [\aleph_1]_{\aleph_0}^m$ .

See Erdos Hajnal Máté Rado [EHMR] for

**Fact 5.1.** *If  $2^{<\mu} < \lambda \leq 2^\mu$ ,  $\mu \not\rightarrow [\mu]_\sigma^n$  then  $\lambda \not\rightarrow [(2^{<\mu})^+]_\sigma^{n+1}$ .*

This shows that if e.g. in 1.4 we want to increase the exponents, to 3 (and still  $\mu = \mu^{<\mu}$ ) e.g.  $\mu$  cannot be successor (when  $\sigma \leq \aleph_0$ ) (by [Sh276], 3.5(2)).

**Definition 5.2.**  $Pr_{np}(\lambda, \mu, \bar{\sigma})$ , where  $\bar{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ , means that there are functions  $F_n : [\lambda]^n \rightarrow \sigma_n$  such that for every  $W \in [\lambda]^\mu$  for some  $n$ ,  $F_n''([W]^n) = \sigma(n)$ . The negation of this property is denoted by  $NPr_{np}(\lambda, \mu, \bar{\sigma})$ .

If  $\sigma_n = \sigma$  we write  $\sigma$  instead of  $\langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ .

**Remark 5.2A.** 1) Note that  $\lambda \rightarrow [\mu]_\sigma^{<\omega}$  means: if  $F : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \sigma$  then for some  $A \in [\lambda]^\mu$ ,  $F''([A]^{<\omega}) \neq \sigma$ . So for  $\lambda \geq \mu \geq \sigma = \aleph_0$ ,  $\lambda \not\rightarrow [\mu]_\sigma^{<\omega}$ , (use  $F : F(\alpha) = |\alpha|$ ) and  $Pr_{np}(\lambda, \mu, \sigma)$  is stronger than  $\lambda \not\rightarrow [\mu]_\sigma^{<\omega}$ .

2) We do not write down the monotonicity properties of  $Pr_{np}$  — they are obvious.

**Claim 5.3** 1) We can (in 5.2) w.l.o.g. use  $F_{n,m} : [\lambda]^n \rightarrow \sigma_n$  for  $n, m < \omega$  and obvious monotonicity properties holds, and  $\lambda \geq \mu \geq n$ .

2) Suppose  $NPr_{np}(\lambda, \mu, \kappa)$  and  $\kappa \not\rightarrow [\kappa]_\sigma^n$  or even  $\kappa \not\rightarrow [\kappa]_\sigma^{<\omega}$ . Then the following case of Chang conjecture holds:

(\*) for every model  $M$  with universe  $\lambda$  and countable vocabulary, there is an elementary submodel  $N$  of  $M$  of cardinality  $\mu$ ,

$$|N \cap \kappa| < \kappa$$

3) If  $NPr_{np}(\lambda, \aleph_1, \aleph_0)$  then  $(\lambda, \aleph_1) \rightarrow (\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$ .

**Proof.** Easy.

**Theorem 5.4.** Suppose  $Pr_{np}(\lambda_0, \mu, \aleph_0)$ ,  $\mu$  regular  $> \aleph_0$  and  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$ , and no  $\mu' \in (\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$  is  $\mu'$ -Mahlo. Then  $Pr_{np}(\lambda_1, \mu, \aleph_0)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\chi = \beth_8(\lambda_1)^+$ , let  $\{F_{n,m}^0 : m < \omega\}$  list the definable  $n$ -place functions in the model  $(H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ , with  $\lambda_0, \mu, \lambda_1$  as parameters, let  $F_{n,m}^1(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$  (for  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} < \lambda_1$ ) be  $F_{n,m}^0(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$  if it is an ordinal  $< \lambda_1$  and zero otherwise. Let  $F_{n,m}(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$  (for  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} < \lambda_1$ ) be  $F_{n,m}^0(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$  if it is an ordinal  $< \omega$  and zero otherwise. We shall show that  $F_{n,m}(n, m < \omega)$  exemplify  $Pr_{np}(\lambda_1, \mu, \aleph_0)$  (see 5.3(1)).

So suppose  $W \in [\lambda_1]^\mu$  is a counterexample to  $Pr(\lambda_1, \mu, \aleph_0)$  i.e. for no  $n, m, F_{n,m}''([W]^n) = \omega$ . Let  $W^*$  be the closure of  $W$  under  $F_{n,m}^1(n, m < \omega)$ . Let  $N$  be the Skolem Hull of  $W$  in  $(H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ , so clearly  $N \cap \lambda_1 = W^*$ . Note  $W^* \subseteq \lambda_1$ ,  $|W^*| = \mu$ . Also as  $\text{cf}(\mu) > \aleph_0$  if  $A \subseteq W^*$ ,  $|A| = \mu$  then for some  $n, m < \omega$  and  $u_i \in [W]^n$  (for  $i < \mu$ ),  $F_{n,m}^1(u_i) \in A$  and  $[i < j < \mu \Rightarrow F_{n,m}^1(u_i) \neq F_{n,m}^1(u_j)]$ . It is easy to check that also  $W^1 = \{F_{n,m}^1(u_i) : i < \mu\}$  is a counterexample to  $Pr(\lambda_1, \mu, \sigma)$ . In particular, for  $n, m < \omega$ ,  $W_{n,m} = \{F_{n,m}^1(u) : u \in [W]^n\}$  is a counterexample if it has power  $\mu$ . W.l.o.g.  $W$  is a counterexample with minimal  $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup(W) = \cup\{\alpha+1 : \alpha \in W\}$ . The above discussion shows that  $|W^* \cap \alpha| < \mu$  for  $\alpha < \delta$ . Obviously  $\text{cf } \delta = \mu^+$ . Let  $\langle \alpha_i : i < \mu \rangle$  be a strictly increasing sequence of members of  $W^*$ , converging to  $\delta$ , such that for limit  $i$  we have  $\alpha_i = \min(W^* - \bigcup_{j < i} (\alpha_j + 1))$ . Let  $N = \bigcup_{i < \mu} N_i$ ,  $N_i \prec N$ ,  $|N_i| < \mu$ ,  $N_i$  increasing continuous and w.l.o.g.  $N_i \cap \delta = N \cap \alpha_i$ .

$\alpha$  Fact:  $\delta$  is  $> \lambda_0$ .

**Proof.** Otherwise we then get an easy contradiction to  $Pr(\lambda_0, \mu, \sigma)$  as choosing the  $F_{n,m}^0$  we allowed  $\lambda_0$  as a parameter.

$\beta$  Fact: If  $F$  is a unary function definable in  $N$ ,  $F(\alpha)$  is a club of  $\alpha$  for every limit ordinal  $\alpha (< \lambda_1)$  then for some club  $C$  of  $\mu$  we have

$$(\forall j \in C \setminus \{\min C\})(\exists i_1 < j)(\forall i \in (i_1, j))[i \in C \Rightarrow \alpha_i \in F(\alpha_j)].$$

**Proof.** For some club  $C_0$  of  $\mu$  we have  $j \in C_0 \Rightarrow (N_j, \{\alpha_i : i < j\}, W) \prec (N, \{\alpha_i : i < \mu\}, W)$ .

We let  $C = C'_0 = \text{acc}(C)$  (= set of accumulation points of  $C_0$ ).

We check  $C$  is as required; suppose  $j$  is a counterexample. So  $j = \sup(j \cap C)$  (otherwise choose  $i_1 = \max(j \cap C)$ ). So we can define, by induction on  $n, i_n$ , such that:

- (a)  $i_n < i_{n+1} < j$
- (b)  $\alpha_{i_n} \notin F(\alpha_j)$
- (c)  $(\alpha_{i_n}, \alpha_{i_{n+1}}) \cap F(\alpha_j) \neq \emptyset$ .

Why  $(C'_0)? \models "F(\alpha_j) \text{ is unbounded below } \alpha_j"$  hence  $N \models "F(\alpha_j) \text{ is unbounded below } \alpha_j"$ , but in  $N$ ,  $\{\alpha_i : i \in C_0, i < j\}$  is unbounded below  $\alpha_j$ .

Clearly for some  $n, m, \alpha_j \in W_{n,m}$  (see above). Now we can repeat the proof of [Sh276,3.3(2)] (see mainly the end) using only members of  $W_{n,m}$ . Note: here we use the number of colors being  $\aleph_0$ .

$\beta^+$  Fact: Wolog the  $C$  in Fact  $\beta$  is  $\mu$ .

Proof: Renaming.

$\gamma$  Fact:  $\delta$  is a limit cardinal.

Proof: Suppose not. Now  $\delta$  cannot be a successor cardinal (as  $\text{cf } \delta = \mu \leq \lambda_0 < \delta$ ) hence for every large enough  $i$ ,  $|\alpha_i| = |\delta|$ , so  $|\delta| \in W^* \subseteq N$  and  $|\delta|^+ \in W^*$ .

So  $W^* \cap |\delta|$  has cardinality  $< \mu$  hence order-type some  $\gamma^* < \mu$ . Choose  $i^* < \mu$  limit such that  $[j < i^* \Rightarrow j + \gamma^* < i^*]$ . There is a definable function  $F$  of  $(H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$  such that for every limit ordinal  $\alpha$ ,  $F(\alpha)$  is a club of  $\alpha$ ,  $0 \in F(\alpha)$ , if  $|\alpha| < \alpha$ ,  $F(\alpha) \cap |\alpha| = \emptyset$ ,  $\text{otp}(F(\alpha)) = \text{cf } \alpha$ .

So in  $N$  there is a closed unbounded subset  $C_{\alpha_j} = F(\alpha_j)$  of  $\alpha_j$  of order type  $\leq \text{cf } \alpha_j \leq |\delta|$ , hence  $C_{\alpha_j} \cap N$  has order type  $\leq \gamma^*$ , hence for  $i^*$  chosen above unboundedly many  $i < i^*$ ,  $\alpha_i \notin C_{\alpha_{i^*}}$ . We can finish by fact  $\beta^+$ .

$\delta$  Fact: For each  $i < \mu$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is a cardinal.

Proof: If  $|\alpha_i| < i$  then  $|\alpha_i| \in N_i$ , but then  $|\alpha_i|^+ \in N_i$  contradicting to Fact  $\gamma$ , by which  $|\alpha_i|^+ < \delta$ , as we have assumed  $N_i \cap \delta = N \cap \alpha_i$ .

$\varepsilon$  Fact: For a club of  $i < \mu$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is a regular cardinal.

(Proof: if  $S = \{i : \alpha_i \text{ singular}\}$  is stationary, then the function  $\alpha_i \rightarrow \text{cf}(\alpha_i)$  is regressive on  $S$ . By Fodor lemma, for some  $\alpha^* < \delta$ ,  $\{i < \mu : \text{cf } \alpha_i < \alpha^*\}$  is stationary. As  $|N \cap \alpha^*| < \mu$  for some  $\beta^*$ ,  $\{i < \mu : \text{cf } \alpha_i = \beta^*\}$  is stationary. Let  $F_{1,m}(\alpha)$  be a club of  $\alpha$  of order type  $\text{cf}(\alpha)$ , and by fact  $\beta$  we get a contradiction as in fact  $\gamma$ .

$\zeta$  Fact: For a club of  $i < \mu$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is Mahlo.

Proof: Use  $F_{1,m}(\alpha)$  = a club of  $\alpha$  which, if  $\alpha$  is a successor cardinal or inaccessible not Mahlo, then it contains no inaccessible, and continue as in fact  $\gamma$ .

**ξ Fact:** For a club of  $i < \mu$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is  $\alpha_i$ -Mahlo.

Proof: Let  $F_{1,m(0)}(\alpha) = \sup\{\zeta : \alpha \text{ is } \zeta\text{-Mahlo}\}$ . If the set  $\{i < \mu : \alpha_i \text{ is not } \alpha_i\text{-Mahlo}\}$  is stationary then as before for some  $\gamma \in N$ ,  $\{i : F_{1,m(0)}(\alpha_i) = \gamma\}$  is stationary and let  $F_{1,m(1)}(\alpha)$  — a club of  $\alpha$  such that if  $\alpha$  is not  $(\gamma + 1)$ -Mahlo then the club has no  $\gamma$ -Mahlo member. Finish as in the proof of fact  $\delta$ . ■

**Remark 5.4.A.** We can continue and say more.

**Lemma 5.5** 1) Suppose  $\lambda > \mu > \theta$  are regular cardinals,  $n \geq 2$  and

- (i) for every regular cardinal  $\kappa$ , if  $\lambda > \kappa \geq \theta$  then  $\kappa \not\vdash [\theta]_{\sigma(1)}^{<\omega}$ .
- (ii) for some  $\alpha(*) < \mu$  for every regular  $\kappa \in (\alpha(*), \lambda)$ ,  $\kappa \not\vdash [\alpha(*)]_{\sigma(2)}^n$ .

Then

- (a)  $\lambda \not\vdash [\mu]_{\sigma}^{n+1}$  where  $\sigma = \min\{\sigma(1), \sigma(2)\}$ ,
- (b) there are functions  $d_2 : [\lambda]^{n+1} \rightarrow \sigma(2)$ ,  $d_1 : [\lambda]^3 \rightarrow \sigma(1)$  such that for every  $W \in [\lambda]^\mu$ ,  $d_1''([W]^3) = \sigma(1)$  or  $d_2''([W]^{n+1}) = \sigma(2)$ .

2) Suppose  $\lambda > \mu > \theta$  are regular cardinals, and

- (i) for every regular  $\kappa \in [\theta, \lambda)$ ,  $\kappa \not\vdash [\theta]_{\sigma(1)}^{<\omega}$ ,
- (ii)  $\sup\{\kappa < \lambda : \kappa \text{ regular}\} \not\vdash [\mu]_{\sigma(2)}^n$ .

Then

- (a)  $\lambda \not\vdash [\mu]_{\sigma}^{2n}$  where  $\sigma = \min\{\sigma(1), \sigma(2)\}$
- (b) there are functions  $d_1 : [\lambda]^3 \rightarrow \sigma(1)$ ,  $d_2 : [\lambda]^{2n} \rightarrow \sigma(2)$  such that for every  $W \in [\lambda]^\mu$ ,  $d_1''([W]^3) = \sigma(1)$  or  $d_2''([W]^{2n}) = \sigma(2)$ .

**Remark.** The proof is similar to that of [Sh276] 3.3,3.2.

**Proof.** 1) We choose for each  $i$ ,  $0 < i < \lambda_i$ ,  $C_i$  such that: if  $i$  is a successor ordinal,  $C_i = \{i - 1, 0\}$ ; if  $i$  is a limit ordinal,  $C_i$  is a club of  $i$  of order type  $\text{cf } i$ ,  $0 \in C_i$ ,  $[\text{cf } i < i \Rightarrow \text{cf } i < \min(C_i - \{0\})]$  and  $C_i \setminus \text{acc}(C_i)$  contains only successor ordinals.

Now for  $\alpha < \beta$ ,  $\alpha > 0$  we define by induction on  $\ell$ ,  $\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)$ ,  $\gamma_\ell^-(\beta, \alpha)$ , and then  $\kappa(\beta, \alpha)$ ,  $\varepsilon(\beta, \alpha)$ .

- (A)  $\gamma_0^+(\beta, \alpha) = \beta$ ,  $\gamma_0^-(\beta, \alpha) = 0$ .
- (B) if  $\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)$  is defined and  $> \alpha$  and  $\alpha$  is not an accumulation point of  $C_{\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)}$  then we let  $\gamma_{\ell+1}^-(\beta, \alpha)$  be the maximal member of  $C_{\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)}$  which is  $< \alpha$  and  $\gamma_{\ell+1}^+(\beta, \alpha)$  is the minimal member of  $C_{\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)}$  which

is  $\geq \alpha$  (by the choice of  $C_{\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)}$  and the demands on  $\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)$  they are well defined).

So

- (B1) (a)  $\gamma_\ell^-(\beta, \alpha) < \alpha \leq \gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)$ , and if the equality holds then  $\gamma_{\ell+1}^+(\beta, \alpha)$  is not defined.
- (b)  $\gamma_{\ell+1}^+(\beta, \alpha) < \gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha)$  when both are defined.
- (C) Let  $k = k(\beta, \alpha)$  be the maximal number  $k$  such that  $\gamma_k^+(\beta, \alpha)$  is defined (it is well defined as  $\langle \gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha) : \ell < \omega \rangle$  is strictly decreasing). So
- (C1)  $\gamma_{k(\beta, \alpha)}^+(\beta, \alpha) = \alpha$  or  $\gamma_{k(\beta, \alpha)}^+(\beta, \alpha) > \alpha$ ,  $\gamma_{k(\beta, \alpha)}^+$  is a limit ordinal and  $\alpha$  is an accumulation point of  $C_{\gamma_{k(\beta, \alpha)}^+}(\beta, \alpha)$ .
- (D) For  $m \leq k(\beta, \alpha)$  let us define

$$\varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha) = \max\{\gamma_\ell^-(\beta, \alpha) + 1 : \ell \leq m\}.$$

Note

- (D1) (a)  $\varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha) \leq \alpha$  (if defined),
- (b) if  $\alpha$  is limit then  $\varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha) < \alpha$  (if defined),
- (c) if  $\varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha) \leq \xi \leq \alpha$  then for every  $\ell \leq m$  we have

$$\gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \alpha) = \gamma_\ell^+(\beta, \xi), \quad \gamma_\ell^-(\beta, \alpha) = \gamma_\ell^-(\beta, \xi), \quad \varepsilon_\ell(\beta, \alpha) = \varepsilon_\ell(\beta, \xi).$$

(explanation for (c): if  $\varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha) < \alpha$  this is easy (check the definition) and if  $\varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha) = \alpha$ , necessarily  $\xi = \alpha$  and it is trivial).

- (d) if  $\ell \leq m$  then  $\varepsilon_\ell(\beta, \alpha) \leq \varepsilon_m(\beta, \alpha)$

For a regular  $\kappa \in (\alpha(*), \lambda)$  let  $g_\kappa^1 : [\kappa]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \sigma(2)$  exemplify  $\kappa \not\rightarrow [\theta]_{\sigma(1)}^{<\omega}$  and for every regular cardinal  $\kappa \in [\theta, \lambda)$  let  $g_\kappa^2 : [\kappa]^n \rightarrow \sigma(2)$  exemplify  $\kappa \not\rightarrow [\alpha(*)]_{\sigma(2)}^n$ . Let us define the colourings:

Let  $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_n$ . Remember  $n \geq 2$ .

Let  $n = n(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  be the maximal natural number such that:

- (i)  $\varepsilon_n(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) < \alpha_0$  is well defined,
- (ii) for  $\ell \leq n$ ,  $\gamma_\ell^-(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) = \gamma_\ell^-(\alpha_0, \alpha_2)$ .

We define  $d_2(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  as  $g_\kappa^2(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \text{cf}(\gamma_{n(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)}^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_1)), \\ \beta_\ell &= \text{otp} \left[ \alpha_\ell \cap C_{\gamma_{n(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)}^+}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next we define  $d_1(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ .

Let  $i(*) = \sup \left[ C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_2)} \cap C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} \right]$  where  $n = n(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ ,  $E$  be the equivalence relation on  $C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_1)} \setminus i(*)$  defined by

$$\gamma_1 E \gamma_2 \Leftrightarrow \forall \gamma \in C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_2)} [\gamma_1 < \gamma \leftrightarrow \gamma_2 < \gamma].$$

If the set  $w = \left\{ \gamma \in C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_1)} : \gamma > i(*), \gamma = \min \gamma / E \right\}$  is finite, we let  $d_1(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  be  $g_\kappa^1(\{\beta_\gamma : \gamma \in w\})$  where  $\kappa = |C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_1)}|$ ,  $\beta_\gamma = \text{otp}(\gamma \cap C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_0, \alpha_1)})$ .

We have defined  $d_1, d_2$  required in condition (b) ( though have not yet proved that they work) We still have to define  $d$  (exemplifying  $\lambda \not\vdash [\mu]_\ell^{n+1}$ ). Let  $n \geq 3$ , for  $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_n$ , we let  $d(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n)$  be  $d_1(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  if  $w$  defined during the definition has odd number of members and  $d_2(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n)$  otherwise.

Now suppose  $Y$  is a subset of  $\lambda$  of order type  $\mu$ , and let  $\delta = \sup Y$ . Let  $M$  be a model with universe  $\lambda$  and with relations  $Y$  and  $\{(i, j) : i \in C_j\}$ . Let  $\langle N_i : i < \mu \rangle$  be an increasing continuous sequence of elementary submodels of  $M$  of cardinality  $< \mu$  such that  $\alpha(i) = \alpha_i = \min(Y \setminus N_i)$  belongs to  $N_{i+1}$ ,  $\sup(N \cap \alpha_i) = \sup(N \cap \delta)$ . Let  $N = \bigcup_{i < \mu} N_i$ . Let  $\delta(i) = \delta_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup(N_i \cap \alpha_i)$ , so  $0 < \delta_i \leq \alpha_i$ , and let  $n = n_i$  be the first natural number such that  $\delta_i$  an accumulation point of  $C^i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_{\gamma_n^+(\alpha_i, \delta(i))}$ , let  $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{n(i)}(\alpha_i, \delta_i)$ . Note that  $\gamma_n^+(\alpha_i, \delta_i) = \gamma_n^+(\alpha_i, \varepsilon_i)$  hence it belongs to  $N$ .

Case I: For some (limit)  $i < \mu$ ,  $\text{cf}(i) \geq \theta$  and  $(\forall \gamma < i)[\gamma + \alpha(*) < i]$  such that for arbitrarily large  $j < i$ ,  $C^i \cap N_j$  is bounded in  $N_j \cap \delta = N_j \cap \delta_j$ .

This is just like the last part in the proof of [Sh276], 3.3 using  $g_\kappa^1$  and  $d_1$  for  $\kappa = \text{cf}(\gamma_{n_i}^+(\alpha_i, \delta_i))$ .

Case II: Not case I.

Let  $S_0 = \{i < \mu : (\forall \alpha < i)[\gamma + \alpha(*) < i], \text{cf}(i) = \theta\}$ . So for every  $i \in S_0$  for some  $j(i) < i$ ,  $(\forall j) \left[ j \in (j(i), i) \Rightarrow C^i \cap N_j \text{ is unbounded in } \delta_j \right]$ . But as  $C^i \cap \delta_i$  is a club of  $\delta_i$ , clearly  $(\forall j) \left[ j \in (j(i), i) \Rightarrow \delta_j \in C^i \right]$ .

We can also demand  $j(i) > \varepsilon_{n(\alpha(i), \delta(i))}(\alpha(i), \delta(i))$ .

As  $S_0$  is stationary, (by not case I) for some stationary  $S_1 \subseteq S_0$  and  $n(*), j(*)$  we have  $(\forall i \in S_1) \left[ j(i) = j(*) \wedge n(\alpha(i), \delta_i) = n(*) \right]$ .

Choose  $i(*) \in S_1$ ,  $i(*) = \sup(i(*) \cap S_1)$ , such that the order type of  $S_1 \cap i(*)$  is  $i(*) > \alpha(*)$ . Now if  $i_2 < i_1 \in S_1 \cap i(*)$  then  $n(\alpha_{i(*)}, \alpha_{i_1}, \alpha_{i_2}) = n(*)$ . Now  $L_{i(*)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \text{otp}(\alpha_i \cap C^{i(*)}) : i \in S_1 \cap i(*) \right\}$  are pairwise distinct and are ordinals  $< \kappa \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |C^{i(*)}|$ , and the set has order type  $\alpha(*)$ . Now apply the definitions of  $d_2$  and  $g_\kappa^2$  on  $L_{i(*)}$ .

2) The proof is like the proof of part (1) but for  $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots$  we let  $d_2(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{2n-1}) = g_\kappa^2(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_n)$  where

$$\beta_\ell \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{otp}(C_{\gamma_n^+(\beta_{2\ell}, \beta_{2\ell+1})}(\beta_{2\ell}, \beta_{2\ell+1}) \cap \beta_{2\ell+1})$$

and in case II note that the analysis gives  $\mu$  possible  $\beta_\ell$ 's so that we can apply the definition of  $g_\kappa^2$ .

**Definition 5.7.** Let  $\lambda \not\rightarrow_{\text{stg}} [\mu]_\theta^n$  mean: if  $d : [\lambda]^n \rightarrow \theta$ , and  $\langle \alpha_i : i < \mu \rangle$  is strictly increasingly continuous and for  $i < j < \mu$ ,  $\gamma_{i,j} \in [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$  then

$$\theta = \left\{ d(w) : \text{for some } j < \mu, w \in [\{\gamma_{i,j} : i < j\}]^n \right\}.$$

**Lemma 5.8.** 1)  $\aleph_t \not\rightarrow [\aleph_1]_{\aleph_0}^{n+1}$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

2)  $\aleph_n \not\rightarrow_{\text{stg}} [\aleph_1]_{\aleph_0}^{n+1}$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

**Proof.** 1) For  $n = 2$  this is a theorem of Torodčević, and if it holds for  $n \geq 2$  by 5.5(1) we get that it holds for  $n+1$  (with  $n, \lambda, \mu, \theta, \alpha(*), \sigma(1), \sigma(2)$  there corresponding to  $n+1, \aleph_{n+1}, \aleph_1, \aleph_0, \aleph_0, \aleph_0, \aleph_0$  here).

2) Similar.

## References

- [EHMR] P. Erdős, A. Hajnal, A. Máté, R. Rado, Combinatorial set theory: partition relations for cardinals, Disq. Math. Hung., no 13, (1984)
- [Gi] M. Gitik, Measurability preserved by  $\kappa$ -complete forcing notion
- [GiSh344] M. Gitik, S. Shelah, On certain indiscernibility of strong cardinals and a question of Hajnal, Archive für Math. Logic, 28(1989) 35–42
- [HL] Halpern, Lauchli,

- [Sh80] S. Shelah, A Weak Generalization of MA to Higher Cardinals, Israel J. of Math, [BSF], 30(1978), 297-306.
- [Sh289] S. Shelah, Consisting of Partition Theorem for Graphs and Models, Proc. of the Torontp 8/87 Conference in General Topology.
- [Sh276] S. Shelah, Was Sierpinsky right I ? Israel J. Math. 62 (1988) 355–380
- [ShSt154] S. Shelah and L. Stanley, Generalized Martin Axiom and the Souslin Hypothesis for Higher Cardinals, Israel J. of Math, [BSF], 43(1982), 225-236.
- [ShSt154a] S. Shelah and L. Stanley, Corrigendum to "Generalized Martin's Axiom and Souslin's Hypothesis for Higher Cardinal, Israel J. of Math, 53(1986), 309-314.
- [To] S. Todorčević, Partitions of pairs of uncountable ordinals, Acta MATH, 159 (1987), 261–294

Saharon Shelah  
*Institute of Mathematics*  
*The Hebrew University*  
*Jerusalem, Israel*